Distributed Linearized Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers for Composite Convex Consensus Optimization

N. S. Aybat*, Z. Wang*, T. Lin†, and S. Ma†

*IE Department, The Pennsylvania State University, PA, USA.

Emails: nsa10@psu.edu, zxw121@psu.edu

†Department of SEEM, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

Emails: linty@se.cuhk.edu.hk, sqma@se.cuhk.edu.hk.

arXiv:1512.08122v3 [math.OC] 4 Mar 2016

Abstract

Given a graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ of agents $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \ldots, N\}$ connected with edges in $\mathcal{E}$, we study how to compute an optimal decision on which there is consensus among agents and that minimizes the sum of agent-specific private convex composite functions $\{\Phi_i : i = 1, \ldots, N\}$ while respecting privacy requirements, where $\Phi_i := \xi_i + f_i$ belongs to agent-i. Assuming only agents connected by an edge can communicate, we propose a distributed proximal gradient method PG-ADMM. In one iteration, each agent-i computes the prox map of ξ_i and gradient of f_i, and this is followed by local communication with neighboring agents. We also study its stochastic gradient variant, SPG-ADMM, which can only access to noisy estimates of ∇f_i at each agent-i. These optimization models abstract a number of applications in distributed sensing, machine learning and statistical inference. We show ergodic convergence in both sub-optimality error and consensus violation for PG-ADMM and SPG-ADMM with rates $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ and $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{t})$, respectively. We implement PG-ADMM and SPG-ADMM on two different, but equivalent, consensus formulations and examine the effect of the underlying network topology on their convergence rate.

Index Terms

linearized ADMM, distributed optimization, composite convex function, augmented Lagrangian, first-order method.

Research of N. S. Aybat was partially supported by NSF grant CMMI-1400217. Research of S. Ma was supported in part by the Hong Kong Research Grants Council General Research Funds Early Career Scheme (Project ID: CUHK 439513).

I. INTRODUCTION

Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ denote a *connected* undirected graph of N computing nodes where nodes i and j can communicate information only if $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$. Each node $i \in \mathcal{N} := \{1, \ldots, N\}$ has a *private* (local) cost function $\Phi_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ such that

$$\Phi_i(x) := \xi_i(x) + f_i(x), \tag{1}$$

where $\xi_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a possibly *non-smooth* convex function, and $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a *smooth* convex function. We assume that f_i is differentiable on an open set containing $\mathbf{dom}\, \xi_i$ with a Lipschitz continuous gradient ∇f_i, of which Lipschitz constant is L_i; and the prox map of ξ_i,

$$\mathbf{prox}_{\xi_i}(x) := \underset{y \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \xi_i(y) + \tfrac{1}{2} \|y - x\|_2^2 \right\}, \tag{2}$$

is *efficiently* computable for $i \in \mathcal{N}$. In this paper, we study a distributed consensus problem [1]; in particular, we consider solving a multi-agent consensus optimization problem of minimizing the sum of privately known composite convex functions in (1):

$$F^* := \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Phi_i(x). \tag{3}$$

We consider the setting where only local information exchange is allowed, i.e., there is no central node such that the data can be collected, and only neighboring nodes can exchange data; and we focus on the following equivalent formulation:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \Big\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} F(\mathbf{x}) := \Phi_i(x_i) : \ x_i = x_j, \ \forall \ (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \Big\}. \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{x} = [x_i]_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}$. We call $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = [\bar{x}_i]_{i \in \mathcal{N}}$, ϵ-feasible if the consensus violation satisfies $\max_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \left\{ \|\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j\|_2 \right\} \leq \epsilon$ and ϵ-optimal if $\left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Phi_i(\bar{x}_i) - F^* \right| \leq \epsilon$.

This computational setting, i.e., decentralized consensus optimization, appears as a generic model for various applications in signal processing, e.g., [2]–[6], machine learning, e.g., [7]–[9] and statistical inference, e.g., [10], [11]. Clearly, (3) can also be solved in a "centralized" fashion by communicating all the private functions Φ_i to a *central* node, and solving the overall problem at this node. However, such an approach can be very expensive both from communication and computation perspectives when compared to the distributed algorithms which are far more scalable to increasing problem data and network sizes. In particular, suppose $(A_i, b_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n+1)}$

and $\Phi_i(x) = \|A_i x - b_i\|_2^2 + \lambda \|x\|_1$ for some given $\lambda > 0$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $m \ll n$ and $N \gg 1$. Hence, (3) is a very large scale LASSO problem with *distributed* data. To solve (3) in a centralized fashion, the data $\{(A_i, b_i) : i \in \mathcal{N}\}$ needs to be communicated to the central node. This can be prohibitively expensive, and may also violate privacy constraints – in case some node i does not want to reveal the details of its *private* data. Furthermore, it requires that the central node has large enough memory to be able to accommodate all the data. On the other hand, at the expense of slower convergence, one can completely do away with a central node, and seek for *consensus* among all the nodes on an optimal decision using "local" decisions communicated by the neighboring nodes. From computational perspective, for certain cases, computing partial gradients *locally* can be more computationally efficient when compared to computing the entire gradient at a central node. These considerations in mind, we propose decentralized algorithms that can compute solutions to (3) using only local computations without explicitly requiring the nodes to communicate the functions $\{\Phi_i : i \in \mathcal{N}\}$; thereby, circumventing all privacy, communication and memory issues.

The contribution of the paper can be summarized as follows: 1) we propose a proximal gradient alternating direction method of multipliers (PG-ADMM) and its stochastic gradient variant SPG-ADMM to solve composite convex problems; we only assume that the prox map of ξ_i can be computed efficiently, while other distributed ADMM based algorithms are efficient when either $\Phi_i = \xi_i + f_i$ or both ξ_i and f_i have *simple* prox maps that can be computed efficiently; 2) we show ergodic convergence of both suboptimality and consensus violation bounds for PG-ADMM with the rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$, and for SPG-ADMM with the rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{t})$; 3) we implement PG-ADMM and SPG-ADMM on two different, but equivalent, consensus formulations of (3) – this gives rise to two different *node-based* distributed algorithms: DPGA-I and DPGA-II and their stochastic gradient variants SDPGA-I and SDPGA-II – and we examine the effect of the underlying network topology on their convergence rate. 4) The proposed algorithms DPGA-I, DPGA-II, SDPGA-I and SDPGA-II are fully distributed, i.e., the agents are *not* required to know any global parameters depending on the entire network topology, e.g., the second smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian; instead, we only assume that agents know who their neighbors are. Using only local communication, our *node-based* distributed algorithms require less communication burden and memory storage compared to edge-based distributed algorithms. 5) Moreover, proposed algorithms consist of a *single loop*, i.e., there are no outer and inner iteration loops; therefore, they are easy and practical to be implemented over distributed networks.

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF OUR METHOD WITH THE PREVIOUS WORK

Reference	**assumption on** Φ_i	operation / iter.	iter # for ϵ-feas.	iter # for ϵ-opt.	comm. steps ϵ-opt.	Single Loop (**simple**)
Duchi et al. (2012) [12]	convex, Lipschitz cont.	subgrad., projection	unknown	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$	yes
Nedic & Ozdaglar (2009) [13]	convex	subgrad.	$\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$	yes
Wei & Ozdaglar (2012) [14]	strictly convex	$\mathbf{prox}_{\Phi_i}$	unknown	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	yes
Makhdoumi & Ozdaglar (2014) [15]	convex	$\mathbf{prox}_{\Phi_i}$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	yes
Wei & Ozdaglar (2013) [16]	convex	$\mathbf{prox}_{\Phi_i}$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	yes
Jakovetic et al. (2014) [17] (D-NC)	smooth convex bounded $\nabla\Phi_i$	$\nabla\Phi_i$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{\epsilon})$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{\epsilon})$	$\mathcal{O}(\log(1/\epsilon)/\sqrt{\epsilon})$	no
Chen & Ozdaglar (2012) [18]	composite convex $\Phi_i = \rho + \gamma_i$ bounded $\nabla\gamma_i$	$\mathbf{prox}_{\rho}$, $\nabla\gamma_i$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{\epsilon})$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{\epsilon})$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	no
Shi et al. (2015) [19] (PG-EXTRA)	composite convex $\Phi_i = \rho_i + \gamma_i$	$\mathbf{prox}_{\rho_i}$, $\nabla\gamma_i$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ KKT	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$	yes
Aybat et al. (2015) [20] (DFAL)	composite convex $\Phi_i = \rho_i + \gamma_i$	$\mathbf{prox}_{\rho_i}$, $\nabla\gamma_i$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	no
Our work (DPGA-I, DPGA-II)	composite convex $\Phi_i = \rho_i + \gamma_i$	$\mathbf{prox}_{\rho_i}$, $\nabla\gamma_i$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$	yes

To sum up, there are many practical problems where one can compute the prox map for ξ_i efficiently; however, computing the prox map for $\Phi_i = \xi_i + f_i$ is not easy. The methods proposed in this paper can compute an ϵ-optimal ϵ-feasible solution in $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ iterations *without* assuming bounded ∇f_i for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$; each iteration of these methods requires computing $\mathbf{prox}_{\xi_i}$ and ∇f_i for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and one or two communication rounds among the neighbors – hence, $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ communications per node in total.

A. Related work

A number of different distributed optimization algorithms have been proposed to solve (4) – see Table I that displays some recent work. Duchi et al. [12] proposed a dual averaging algorithm to solve (3) in a distributed fashion over $\mathcal{G}$ when each Φ_i is convex. This algorithm computes ϵ-optimal solution in $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ iterations; however, they do not provide any guarantees on the consensus violation $\max\{\|\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j\|_2 : \ (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$. Nedić and Ozdaglar [13] developed a subgradient method with constant step size $c > 0$ for distributed minimization of (3) where the network topology is time-varying. Setting the subgradient stepsize $c = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ in their method guarantees to compute a solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = [\bar{x}_i]_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$ such that its consensus violation $\max\{\|\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j\|_2 : \ (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\} \leq \epsilon$ within $\mathcal{O}(1)$ iterations; and its suboptimality is bounded from above as $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \Phi_i(\bar{x}_i) - F^* \leq \epsilon$ within $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ iterations; however, since the step size is constant, neither suboptimality nor consensus errors are guaranteed to decrease further. Although these algorithms are for more general problems and assume mere convexity on each Φ_i, this generality comes at the cost of $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ complexity bounds, and they also tend to be very slow in practice. On the other extreme, under much stronger conditions: assuming each Φ_i is *smooth* and has *bounded* gradients, Jakovetic et al. [17] developed a fast distributed gradient method D-NC (the distributed Nesterov gradient with consensus iterations) with $\mathcal{O}(\log(1/\epsilon)/\sqrt{\epsilon})$ convergence

rate in communication rounds. For the quadratic loss, which is one of the most commonly used loss functions, *bounded* gradient assumption does *not* hold. In terms of distributed applicability, D-NC requires all the nodes $\mathcal{N}$ to agree on a doubly stochastic weight matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}|\times|\mathcal{N}|}$; it also assumes that the second largest eigenvalue of $W \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}|\times|\mathcal{N}|}$ is known globally among all the nodes – this is not attainable for very large scale fully distributed networks. D-NC is a two-loop algorithm: for each outer loop k, each node computes their gradients once, and it is followed by $\mathcal{O}(\log(k))$ communication rounds. In the rest of this section, we briefly discuss those algorithms that balance the trade-off between the iteration complexity and the required assumptions on $\{\Phi_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$.

Wei & Ozdaglar [14], [16], and recently Makhdoumi & Ozdaglar [15] proposed distributed ADMM algorithms that can compute an ϵ-optimal and ϵ-feasible solution in $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ prox map evaluations for each Φ_i. These algorithms have superior iteration complexity compared to the subgradient methods discussed above. That said, there are many practical problems where one can compute the prox map for ξ_i efficiently; but, computing the prox map for $\Phi_i = \xi_i + f_i$ is *not* easy -see Section III for an example. One can overcome this limitation of ADMM by locally splitting variables, i.e., setting $\Phi_i(x_i, y_i) := \xi_i(x_i) + f_i(y_i)$, and adding a constraint $x_i = y_i$ in (4). However, this approach more than *doubles* local memory requirement; and in order for ADMM to be efficient, the prox maps for *both* ξ_i and f_i still must be simple.

When node functions Φ_i are composite convex, i.e., $\Phi_i = \xi + f_i$, assuming that the non-smooth term ξ is the *same* at all nodes, and ∇f_i is *bounded* for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, Chen & Ozdaglar [18] proposed an inexact proximal-gradient method, which exploits the function structure, for distributed minimization of (3) over a time-varying network topology. Their method also consists of two loops; it can compute ϵ-feasible and ϵ-optimal solution in $T = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{\epsilon})$ iterations which require k communication rounds with neighbors during the k-th iteration for each $1 \leq k \leq T$ – hence, leading to $\sum_{k=1}^{T} k = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ communications per node in total. Note that there are also many practical problems where nodes in the network have different non-smooth components in their objective and/or have different preference when choosing non-smooth regularizers. In contrast, the methods proposed in this paper allow node specific non-smooth functions ξ_i, do not assume bounded ∇f_i for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and are still able to compute an ϵ-optimal ϵ-feasible solution in $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ iterations, where each iteration requires computing $\mathbf{prox}_{\xi_i}$ and ∇f_i for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and one or two communication rounds among the neighbors – hence, $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ communications per node in total.

Recently, Shi et al. [19] and Aybat et al. [20] proposed proximal gradient based distributed algorithms that can solve (3) over a static connected network when $\Phi_i = \xi_i + f_i$ as in (1); hence, both algorithms can handle node specific non-smooth terms. In [19], the proximal gradient exact first-order algorithm (PG-EXTRA) is proposed to solve composite optimization in a distributed fashion – PG-EXTRA is an extension of the algorithm EXTRA [21] to handle the non-smooth terms $\{\xi_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$. They showed $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ convergence for the ergodic average of *squared* residuals for the consensus and KKT violations. That said, we consider their rate result as $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{t})$ because their result on consensus violation, $\frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=1}\left\|U\mathbf{x}^k\right\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/t)$, only guarantees $\|U\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\| = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{t})$, where $\mathbf{x}^k = [x_i^k]_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}$ denotes PG-EXTRA iterate at iteration $k \geq 1$, $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t := \sum_{k=1}^t \mathbf{x}^k/t$ denotes their ergodic average, and $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|\times n|\mathcal{N}|}$ such that null space of U only contains $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}$, i.e., $U\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ implies $x_1 = \ldots = x_N$. PG-EXTRA is a node-based distributed algorithm, and each node $i \in \mathcal{N}$ stores *four* different copies of local variable x_i at each iteration k, say $x_i^{k+3/2}, x_i^{k+1}, x_i^{k+1/2}$ and x_i^k, and requires *two* rounds of local communications to be able to compute next iterates – one can reduce the information exchange to one round per iteration at the expense of increasing the storage at node i from $4n$ to $(4+d_i)n$. In terms of applicability, PG-EXTRA requires all the nodes $\mathcal{N}$ to agree on two *symmetric* mixing matrices: $W, \tilde{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}|\times|\mathcal{N}|}$ such that $\tilde{W} \succ \mathbf{0}$ and $\frac{W+I}{2} \succeq \tilde{W} \succeq W$ – see Assumption 1 in [19]. The gradient stepsize, c, is the *same* for all nodes, and should satisfy $c < \sigma_{\min}(\tilde{W})/L_{\max}$. If W, $\tilde{W}$ are chosen such that $W \succeq \mathbf{0}$ (this requires coordination among all the agents), and $\tilde{W} = \frac{W+I}{2}$, then c can be chosen $c \in (0, \frac{1}{L_{\max}})$, which is independent of the global topology, and only depends on $L_{\max} := \max_{i\in\mathcal{N}} L_i$ – some max-consensus algorithm is needed to compute $L_{\max}$, and this may not be feasible for very large scale fully distributed networks.

Aybat et al. [20] proposed a distributed first-order augmented Lagrangian (DFAL) algorithm to solve (3), where each Φ_i is a composite convex function as in (1). Assuming ξ_i is bounded below by some norm, i.e., $\xi_i(.) \geq \|.\|$, and it has a uniformly bounded subdifferential for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$, they showed that any limit point of DFAL iterates is optimal; and for any $\epsilon > 0$, an ϵ-optimal and ϵ-feasible solution can be computed within $\mathcal{O}(\log(\epsilon^{-1}))$ DFAL iterations, which require $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\sigma_{\max}^{1.5}(\Omega)}{d_{\min}}\ \epsilon^{-1})$ gradient computations and communications per node in total, where Ω denotes the Laplacian of $\mathcal{G}$, and $d_{\min}$ is the degree of the smallest degree node. Note that many regularizers used in the machine learning and statistics, e.g., ℓ_p-norms, group norm, nuclear norm, and positive weighted sum of these norms, satisfy these assumptions on ξ_i. Based on our tests and the results reported in [20] the algorithm DFAL performs very well in practice; however, its

implementation on a network of distributed agents requires a more complex network protocol. Specifically, checking the subgradient stopping criterion for inner iterations requires evaluating a logical conjunction over $\mathcal{G}$, which may not be easy for large networks.

Table II summarizes the storage and communication requirements for the algorithms discussed above. We will illustrate their practical performance in Section III. After we started writing this paper, we recently became aware of three recent works proposed in [2], [22], [23] for solving (3) over a connected graph $\mathcal{G}$. These methods are very closely related to our proximal gradient ADMM (PG-ADMM), and are based on linearized ADMM method. Suppose $\Phi_i(x) = \xi_i(x) + f(A_i x)$. When compared to our smooth convexity assumption on $\{f_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$, Chang et al. [2] showed the convergence of their distributed method under a far more stringent assumption: f_i is *strongly* convex with a Lipschitz continuous gradient for $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Moreover, under this stronger assumption, they were able to show linear convergence rate *only* when the non-smooth terms are absent, i.e., $\xi_i \equiv 0$, and A_i has full column rank for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Finally, their distributed algorithm requires the global knowledge of $\sigma_{\min}(\Omega + W)$ of the graph $\mathcal{G}$, where Ω is the graph Laplacian, and W is the adjacency matrix – this assumption is not attainable for very large scale fully distributed networks. On the other hand, the algorithms we propose in this paper are fully distributed, i.e., the agents do not require the knowledge of some global parameters depending on the entire network topology; instead, we only assume that agents know who their neighbors are. Ling et al. [23] were able to show the convergence of their distributed method without strong convexity when penalty parameter is chosen sufficiently large; however, no rate has been shown for this setting – again, as in [2] determining whether the parameter is large enough requires the global knowledge of $\sigma_{\min}(\Omega)$. The algorithm in [23] is similar to our DPGA-II algorithm, and in contrast to sublinear rate result shown in this manuscript, Ling et al. were able to establish a rate result only under strong convexity assumption. Bianchi et al. [22] also proposed a distributed algorithm based on linearized ADMM for solving (3), where each node computes proximal gradient steps; the authors proved its convergence and also show almost sure convergence for its randomized version, where a random set of agents become active and compute their proximal gradient steps and broadcast the recently updated local variables to their neighbors. However, no rate has been shown for neither the deterministic nor the randomized versions. The methods in [22] run on edge-based formulations of the decentralized problem; due to the nature of edge-based distributed algorithms, they require each node to store a dual variable for each edge it is linked to, and to memorize all its neighbor's local variables in addition to

its own local variable; and this information is being exchanged at every iteration. Consequently, information exchange, computational effort and memory requirement are far more expensive than node-based algorithms proposed in this paper.

TABLE II
COMPARISON ON DATA AMOUNT STORED AND COMMUNICATED PER NODE PER COMMUNICATION ROUND (ITERATION)

	DPGA-I	DPGA-II	ADMM	SADMM	DFAL	PG-EXTRA
Storage	$3n$	$3n$	$3n$	$7n$	$4n$	$4n$ or $(4+d_i)n$
Communication	$2n$	n	$2n$	$4n$	n	$2n$ or (n)

To sum up, unlike two-loop methods, e.g., [17], [18], [20], DPGA algorithms proposed here have only single-loop, and they are *very easy* to implement - see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. These surprisingly simple algorithms can compute an ϵ-feasible and ϵ-optimal solution to (3) within $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ communication rounds among neighboring nodes for all $\epsilon > 0$ (this is the best rate known for our setting) under much weaker assumptions on ρ_i and f_i compared to DFAL and with much simpler set of instructions compared to all the algorithms discussed above. To the best of our knowledge, in terms of storage and communication requirements per communication round, and convergence rate in terms of communication rounds, DPGA-II achieves the best guarantees known in the literature for problem (3) when Φ_i is as in (1) for $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Proximal Gradient ADMM

Let $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \ldots, N\}$, and $\{\Phi_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$ be a collection of composite convex functions such that $\Phi_i(x_i) = \xi_i(x_i) + f_i(x_i)$, where for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ both $\xi_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, and $f_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \to \mathbb{R}$ are convex, and f_i is differentiable on an open set containing $\mathbf{dom}\, \xi_i$ with a Lipschitz continuous gradient ∇f_i, of which Lipschitz constant is L_i. Let $g : \mathbb{R}^{n_y} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a possibly non-smooth convex function. Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \to \mathbb{R}$ denotes $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} f_i(x_i)$, where $n_x := \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} n_i$ and $\mathbf{x} = [x_i]_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$. Throughout the paper, we adopt the notation $\mathbf{x} = [x_i]_{i\in\mathcal{N}} = (x_i; x_{-i}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ with $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and $x_{-i} = [x_j]_{j\in\mathcal{N}\setminus\{i\}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x - n_i}$ to denote a vector where x_i and x_{-i} are treated as variable and parameter sub-vectors of $\mathbf{x}$, respectively; and $\nabla_{x_i} f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$

denotes the sub-vector of $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ corresponding to components of $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$. In this section we consider the following problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} \quad F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) := g(y) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Phi_i(x_i) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad A_i x_i + B_i y = b_i : \ \lambda_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{5}$$

where $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n_i}$, $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n_y}$, $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ denotes the dual variable corresponding to the i-th constraint. We assume that $\{\xi_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$ and g have easy prox maps. Define the augmented Lagrangian function as

$$\mathcal{L}_\gamma(x,y,\lambda) = g(y) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \xi_i(x_i) + \phi_\gamma(x,y,\lambda),$$

where $\lambda = [\lambda_i]_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$, and ϕ_γ denotes the smooth part of the augmented Lagrangian, i.e.,

$$\phi_\gamma(x,y,\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i(x_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i^\top (A_i x_i + B_i y - b_i) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|A_i x_i + B_i y - b_i\|^2.$$

Note setting $\gamma = 0$ gives the standard Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L}(x,y,\lambda) = \mathcal{L}_0(x,y,\lambda)$.

Consider the algorithm PG-ADMM stated below for solving (5): for $k \geq 0$ compute

$$\begin{aligned} x_i^{k+1} &:= \mathbf{prox}_{c_i\xi_i}\Big(x_i^k - c_i \nabla_{x_i} \phi_\gamma(x_i^k, y^k, \lambda^k)\Big), \quad i \in \mathcal{N} \\ y^{k+1} &:= \operatorname*{argmin}_y \ \mathcal{L}_\gamma(x^{k+1}, y, \lambda^k) \\ \lambda_i^{k+1} &:= \lambda_i^k + \gamma(A_i x_i^{k+1} + B_i y^{k+1} - b_i), \quad i \in \mathcal{N} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $c_i > 0$ is the gradient step size for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, which should be related to L_i and $\sigma_{\max}(A_i)$. In Section II-A2, we study the convergence properties of (6) given a deterministic first-order oracle which returns ∇f_i; and we also consider the effect of using stochastic first-order oracle, which returns noisy observations of ∇f_i, on the convergence rate.

Definition 1. *Given $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ such that $\mathbf{dom}\, f$ is open, and ∇f exists on $\mathbf{dom}\, f$. $G : \mathbb{R}^n \times \Xi \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is called a stochastic first-order oracle (SFO) for ∇f if there exists $\sigma \in [0,+\infty)$ such that for all $x \in \mathbf{dom}\, f$, $\mathbb{E}_\zeta\big[G(x,\zeta)\big] = \nabla f(x)$, and $\mathbb{E}_\zeta\big[\, \|G(x,\zeta) - \nabla f(x)\|^2 \,\big] \leq \sigma^2$, where $\zeta \in \Xi$ is a random variable following a certain distribution.*

Definition 2. *Let G_i denote an SFO for ∇f_i for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ with common parameter σ. Let G_i^γ be an SFO for $\nabla_{x_i}\phi_\gamma(\cdot, x_{-i}, y, \lambda)$ defined as $G_i^\gamma(x_i, \zeta_i; x_{-i}, y, \lambda) = G_i(x_i,\zeta_i) + A_i^\mathsf{T}\left(\lambda_i + \gamma(A_i x_i + B_i y - b_i)\right)$.*

Assumption 1. *$\{\zeta_i^k \in \Xi : i \in \mathcal{N},\ k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ is a set of independent identically distributed random variables.*

Under Assumption 1, consider the algorithm SPG-ADMM stated below for solving (5): for $k \geq 0$ compute

$$\begin{aligned} x_i^{k+1} &:= \mathbf{prox}_{c_i\xi_i}\Big(x_i^k - c_i^k G_i^\gamma(x_i^k, \zeta_i^k; x_{-i}^k, y^k, \lambda^k)\Big),\ i \in \mathcal{N} \\ y^{k+1} &:= \operatorname*{argmin}_y\ \mathcal{L}_\gamma(x^{k+1}, y, \lambda^k) \\ \lambda_i^{k+1} &:= \lambda_i^k + \gamma(A_i x_i^{k+1} + B_i y^{k+1} - b_i), \quad i \in \mathcal{N} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $c_i^k > 0$ is the stochastic-gradient step size for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ at the k-th iteration.

Remark 1. *In the extreme case that $\xi_i = 0, i \in \mathcal{N}$, PG-ADMM* (6) *and SPG-ADMM* (7) *reduce to G-ADMM and SG-ADMM that take gradient steps for x_i-subproblems and have been studied in [24] and [25]. Specifically, [25] proves the $O(1/t)$ convergence rate of G-ADMM and $O(1/\sqrt{t})$ convergence rate of SG-ADMM. Our PG-ADMM and SPG-ADMM can be viewed as extensions of G-ADMM and SG-ADMM where general ξ_i's are allowed. Our proofs of convergence rate results for PG-ADMM and SPG-ADMM in Section II-A2 are closely related to and inspired by [25].*

1) Preliminaries, Notations and Simple Identities: Given a symmetric positive definite matrix $Q \in \mathbb{S}^n$, i.e., $Q \succ \mathbf{0}$, define $\|v\|_Q := \sqrt{v^\top Q v}$ for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In our analysis, we used the two well-known identities frequently:

$$(v_2 - v_1)^\top Q(v_3 - v_1) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\|v_2 - v_1\|_Q^2 + \|v_3 - v_1\|_Q^2 - \|v_2 - v_3\|_Q^2\right), \tag{8}$$

$$(v_1 - v_2)^\top Q(v_3 - v_4) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\|v_1 - v_4\|_Q^2 - \|v_1 - v_3\|_Q^2\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\|v_2 - v_3\|_Q^2 - \|v_2 - v_4\|_Q^2\right). \tag{9}$$

For simplicity, we adopted the following notation to denote the stacked vectors or tuples: $\mathbf{x} = [x_1^\top, \ldots, x_N^\top]^\top$, $\mathbf{x}^k = [x_1^{k\top}, \ldots, x_N^{k\top}]^\top$, and $\mathbf{x}^* = [x_1^{*\top}, \ldots, x_N^{*\top}]^\top$. Let $u = [\mathbf{x}^\top y^\top]^\top$, $\lambda = [\lambda_1^\top \ldots \lambda_N^\top]^\top$, and $w = [u^\top \lambda^\top]^\top$; and let u^k, u^*, λ^k, λ^*, w^k, w^* be defined similarly. For the sake of simplifying the notational burden, we also adopted $(\mathbf{x}, y, \lambda) := [\mathbf{x}^\top, y^\top, \lambda^\top]^\top$. Let $m := \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} m_i$, $n_x := \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} n_i$, and $F : \mathbb{R}^{n_x+n_y} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ such that F denotes the objective function of problem (5), i.e., $F(u) := g(y) + \sum_{i=1}^N \Phi_i(x_i)$. Throughout the paper, $\|x\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm of x, and I_n denotes n-by-n identity matrix.

We denote the set of optimal primal-dual pairs for (5) as χ^*, i.e., $w^* = (\mathbf{x}^*, y^*, \lambda^*) \in \chi^*$ if and only if w^* is a saddle point of the Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0$ corresponding to (5). The following assumption is made in the rest of the discussions.

Assumption 2. *The optimal primal-dual pair set χ^* for* (5) *is non-empty, i.e., there exists $(\mathbf{x}^*, y^*, \lambda^*) \in \chi^*$ such that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, y, \lambda^*) \geq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^*, y^*, \lambda^*) \geq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^*, y^*, \lambda)$ for all $\mathbf{x}$, y, λ.*

According to the first-order optimality conditions for (5), solving (5) is equivalent to finding $(\mathbf{x}^*, y^*, \lambda^*) \in \chi^*$ such that the following holds:

$$\begin{cases} -A_i^\top \lambda_i^* - \nabla f_i(x_i^*) \in \partial \xi_i(x_i^*), \quad i \in \mathcal{N}, \\ -\sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top \lambda_i^* \in \partial g(y^*), \\ A_i x_i^* + B_i y^* - b_i = 0, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}. \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

We analyze both PG-ADMM and SPG-ADMM, stated in (6) and in (7), respectively, under Assumption 2.

2) Convergence Rate of PG-ADMM and SPG-ADMM: In this section, we prove the $O(1/t)$ and $O(1/\sqrt{t})$ ergodic convergence rates for PG-ADMM and SPG-ADMM stated in (6) and (7), respectively, under Assumption 2. Note PG-ADMM and SPG-ADMM produce the same iterate sequence with probability 1 when $\sigma = 0$ in Definition 2. Therefore, we will first analyze SPG-ADMM, and then derive the bounds for PG-ADMM by sharpening the SPG-ADMM bounds for the case $\sigma = 0$. After some constant terms are discarded, SPG-ADMM for solving (5) can be stated as: for $k \geq 0$,

$$x_i^{k+1} := \mathbf{prox}_{c_i \xi_i}\left(x_i^k - c_i\left(G_i(x_i^k, \zeta_i^k) + \gamma A_i^\top\left(A_i x_i^k + B_i y^k - b_i + \frac{1}{\gamma}\lambda_i^k\right)\right)\right), \quad i \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{11}$$

$$y^{k+1} := \underset{y}{\operatorname{argmin}}\ g(y) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\sum_{i=1}^N \left\| A_i x_i^{k+1} + B_i y - b_i + \frac{1}{\gamma}\lambda_i^k \right\|^2, \tag{12}$$

$$\lambda_i^{k+1} := \lambda_i^k + \gamma\left(A_i x_i^{k+1} + B_i y^{k+1} - b_i\right), \quad i \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{13}$$

The first-order optimality conditions for (11)-(12) are given respectively as follows

$$\partial \xi_i(x_i^{k+1}) \ni \frac{1}{c_i}\left(x_i^k - x_i^{k+1}\right) - \left[G_i(x_i^k, \zeta_i^k) + A_i^\top\left(\lambda_i^k + \gamma\left(A_i x_i^k + B_i y^k - b_i\right)\right)\right], \ i \in \mathcal{N}$$

$$\partial g(y^{k+1}) \ni -\sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top\left(\lambda_i^k + \gamma\left(A_i x_i^{k+1} + B_i y^{k+1} - b_i\right)\right).$$

Since ξ_i and g are convex, using the subgradients above with (13), we have

$$\xi_i(x_i) - \xi_i(x_i^{k+1}) \geq \left(x_i - x_i^{k+1}\right)^\top \left[\frac{1}{c_i}\left(x_i^k - x_i^{k+1}\right) - \left(G_i(x_i^k, \zeta_i^k) + A_i^\top \lambda_i^{k+1} + \gamma A_i^\top \left(A_i(x_i^k - x_i^{k+1}) + B_i(y^k - y^{k+1})\right)\right)\right], \tag{14}$$

$$g(y) - g(y^{k+1}) \geq -\left(y - y^{k+1}\right)^\top \sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top \lambda_i^{k+1}. \tag{15}$$

for any $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$.

Let $\delta_i^k := G_i(x_i^k, \zeta_i^k) - \nabla_i f_i(x_i^k)$ denote the error in the noisy gradient generated by SFO, and $D := \max_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \sup_{x,x'\in \mathbf{dom}(\xi_i)} \|x - x'\|$ – if the domain of each ξ_i for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is compact, then $D < +\infty$.

Lemma 2. *Let $\{w^k\}_{k\geq 1}$ be the SPG-ADMM iterate sequence generated as in* (11)-(13) *starting from given w^0. If $\{c_i^k\}_k$ satisfies $c_i^k \leq \left(L_i + \gamma\sigma_{\max}^2(A_i) + \mathbb{1}(\delta_i^k)(1+\sqrt{k})\right)^{-1}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $k \geq 0$, then for any λ and $u^* = (\mathbf{x}^*, y^*) \in \chi^*$, the following inequality holds for all $k \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&F(u^*) - F(u^{k+1}) \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i^* - x_i^{k+1})^\top A_i^\top \lambda_i^{k+1} + (y^* - y^{k+1})^\top \sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top \lambda_i^{k+1} + \sum_{i=1}^N (\lambda_i - \lambda_i^{k+1})^\top (b_i - A_i x_i^{k+1} - B_i y^{k+1}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{1}{\gamma}\left\|\lambda_i - \lambda_i^k\right\|^2 - \frac{1}{\gamma}\left\|\lambda_i - \lambda_i^{k+1}\right\|^2 + \frac{1}{c_i^k}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^k\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i} - \frac{1}{c_i^k}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i}\right. \\
&\left. + \gamma\left\|A_i x_i^* + B_i y^k - b_i\right\|^2 - \gamma\left\|A_i x_i^* + B_i y^{k+1} - b_i\right\|^2 + 2(x_i^* - x_i^k)^\top \delta_i^k + \frac{\left\|\delta_i^k\right\|^2}{1+\sqrt{k}}\right] \geq 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where $\delta_i^k := G_i(x_i^k, \zeta_i^k) - \nabla_i f_i(x_i^k)$, and $\mathbb{1}(\delta_i^k)$ is 1 if $\left\|\delta_i^k\right\| > 0$, and equal to 0 otherwise, i.e., when $\delta_i^k = 0$.

Proof. Note that (14) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\xi_i(x_i) - \xi_i(x_i^{k+1}) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{c_i^k}\left(x_i - x_i^{k+1}\right)^\top \left(I - c_i^k \gamma A_i^\top A_i\right)\left(x_i^k - x_i^{k+1}\right) - \left(x_i - x_i^{k+1}\right)^\top \left(G_i(x_i^k, \zeta_i^k) + A_i^\top \lambda_i^{k+1} + \gamma A_i^\top B_i(y^k - y^{k+1})\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2c_i^k}\left\|x_i - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i} + \frac{1}{2c_i^k}\left\|x_i^k - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i} - \frac{1}{2c_i^k}\left\|x_i - x_i^k\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i} - \left(x_i - x_i^{k+1}\right)^\top \nabla f_i(x_i^k) \\
&\quad - \left(x_i - x_i^{k+1}\right)^\top \delta_i^k - \left(x_i - x_i^{k+1}\right)^\top A_i^\top \lambda_i^{k+1} - \gamma\left(A_i x_i - A_i x_i^{k+1}\right)^\top \left(B_i y^k - B_i y^{k+1}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where the equality follows from identity (8) with $Q = I_{n_i} - \gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i$, and the definition of $\delta_i^k := G_i(x_i^k, \zeta_i^k) - \nabla_i f_i(x_i^k)$. Since each f_i is convex with Lipschitz continuous ∇f_i for all $x_i \in \mathbf{dom}\,\xi_i$, we have $0 \leq f_i(x_i) - f_i(x_i^k) - \nabla f_i(x_i^k)^\top (x_i - x_i^k) \leq \frac{L_i}{2}\left\|x_i - x_i^k\right\|^2$. Hence, it is

easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}\left(x_i - x_i^{k+1}\right)^\top \nabla f_i(x_i^k) &= \left(x_i - x_i^k\right)^\top \nabla f_i(x_i^k) + \left(x_i^k - x_i^{k+1}\right)^\top \nabla f_i(x_i^k) \\ &\leq f_i(x_i) - f_i(x_i^k) + f_i(x_i^k) - f_i(x_i^{k+1}) + \frac{L_i}{2}\left\|x_i^k - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2 \\ &= f_i(x_i) - f_i(x_i^{k+1}) + \frac{L_i}{2}\left\|x_i^k - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Moreover, it also trivially follows from the definition of $\mathbb{1}(\delta_i^k)$ that

$$\left(x_i - x_i^{k+1}\right)^\top \delta_i^k \leq \left(x_i - x_i^k\right)^\top \delta_i^k + \frac{1}{2(1+\sqrt{k})}\left\|\delta_i^k\right\|^2 + \frac{\mathbb{1}(\delta_i^k)(1+\sqrt{k})}{2}\left\|x_i^k - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2. \tag{19}$$

Finally, applying identity (9) with $Q = I_{m_i}$, $v_1 = A_i x_i - b_i$, $v_2 = A_i x_i^{k+1} - b_i$, $v_3 = -B_i y^{k+1}$, and $v_4 = -B_i y^k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(A_i x_i - A_i x_i^{k+1}\right)^\top \left(B_i y^k - B_i y^{k+1}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\|A_i x_i + B_i y^k - b_i\|^2 - \|A_i x_i + B_i y^{k+1} - b_i\|^2\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\|A_i x_i^{k+1} + B_i y^{k+1} - b_i\|^2 - \|A_i x_i^{k+1} + B_i y^k - b_i\|^2\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\|A_i x_i + B_i y^k - b_i\|^2 - \|A_i x_i + B_i y^{k+1} - b_i\|^2\right) + \frac{1}{2\gamma^2}\left\|\lambda_i^k - \lambda_i^{k+1}\right\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Therefore, using (18), (19) and (20) within (17), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\xi_i(x_i) - \xi_i(x_i^{k+1}) + f_i(x_i) - f_i(x_i^{k+1}) + \left(x_i - x_i^{k+1}\right)^\top A_i^\top \lambda_i^{k+1} + \frac{1}{2\gamma}\left\|\lambda_i^k - \lambda_i^{k+1}\right\|^2 + (x_i - x_i^k)^\top \delta_i^k + \frac{\left\|\delta_i^k\right\|^2}{2(1+\sqrt{k})} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2c_i^k}\left\|x_i - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i} - \frac{1}{2c_i^k}\left\|x_i - x_i^k\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i} + \frac{1}{2c_i^k}\left\|x_i^k - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i} \\ &\quad - \frac{L_i + \mathbb{1}(\delta_i^k)(1+\sqrt{k})}{2}\left\|x_i^k - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|A_i x_i + B_i y^{k+1} - b_i\|^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2}\|A_i x_i + B_i y^k - b_i\|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2c_i^k}\left\|x_i - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i} - \frac{1}{2c_i^k}\left\|x_i - x_i^k\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i} + \frac{\gamma}{2}\left\|A_i x_i + B_i y^{k+1} - b_i\right\|^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2}\left\|A_i x_i + B_i y^k - b_i\right\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows from the condition $0 < c_i^k \leq \left(L_i + \gamma\sigma_{\max}^2(A_i) + \mathbb{1}(\delta_i^k)(1+\sqrt{k})\right)^{-1}$. Indeed, this condition implies $\frac{1}{c_i^k}\left\|x_i^k - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i} \geq \left(L_i + \mathbb{1}(\delta_i^k)(1+\sqrt{k})\right)\left\|x_i^k - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2$. Next, combining (13) and (15) together with the above inequality implies that for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\begin{aligned}&F(u^*) - F(u^{k+1}) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i^* - x_i^{k+1})^\top A_i^\top \lambda_i^{k+1} + (y^* - y^{k+1})^\top \sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top \lambda_i^{k+1} + \sum_{i=1}^N (\lambda_i - \lambda_i^{k+1})^\top (b_i - A_i x_i^{k+1} - B_i y^{k+1}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{1}{\gamma}\left\|\lambda_i^k - \lambda_i^{k+1}\right\|^2 - \frac{2}{\gamma}\left(\lambda_i - \lambda_i^{k+1}\right)^\top \left(\lambda_i^k - \lambda_i^{k+1}\right) + \frac{1}{c_i^k}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^k\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i} - \frac{1}{c_i^k}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i}\right. \\ &\left. + \gamma\left\|A_i x_i^* + B_i y^k - b_i\right\|^2 - \gamma\left\|A_i x_i^* + B_i y^{k+1} - b_i\right\|^2 + 2(x_i^* - x_i^k)^\top \delta_i^k + \frac{\left\|\delta_i^k\right\|^2}{1+\sqrt{k}}\right] \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Using (8) with $Q = I_{m_i}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2\gamma}\left\|\lambda_i^{k+1} - \lambda_i^k\right\|^2 - \frac{1}{\gamma}\left(\lambda_i - \lambda_i^{k+1}\right)^\top \left(\lambda_i^k - \lambda_i^{k+1}\right) = \frac{1}{2\gamma}\left(\left\|\lambda_i - \lambda_i^k\right\|^2 - \left\|\lambda_i - \lambda_i^{k+1}\right\|^2\right).$$

Setting $u = u^*$ in (21) and using the above equality, we obtain the desired inequality (16). □

Lemma 3. *Under Assumption 1, let $\{w^k\}_{k\geq 1}$ be the SPG-ADMM iterate sequence generated as in* (11)-(13) *starting from given $w^0 = (\mathbf{x}^0, y^0, \lambda^0)$. Define $\bar{u}^t = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t, \bar{y}^t)$ as $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t = \frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=1}^t \mathbf{x}^k$, and $\bar{y}^t = \frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=1}^t y^k$ for $t \geq 1$. Fix arbitrary λ and $u^* = (\mathbf{x}^*, y^*) \in \chi^*$.*

Suppose $\sigma > 0$. When $\{c_i^k\}_k$ sequence is chosen as $c_i^k = \left(L_i + \gamma\sigma_{\max}^2(A_i) + 1 + \sqrt{k}\right)^{-1}$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, the following bound holds for all $t \geq 1$,

$$F\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\bar{u}^t\right]\right) - F(u^*) + \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^\top \left(A_i\mathbb{E}\left[\bar{x}_i^t\right] + B_i\mathbb{E}\left[\bar{y}^t\right] - b_i\right) \tag{22}$$

$$\leq \frac{N(D^2 + 2\sigma^2)}{2\sqrt{t}} + \frac{1}{2t}\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{\gamma}\left\|\lambda_i - \lambda_i^0\right\|^2 + \frac{1}{c_i^0}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^0\right\|^2_{I - \gamma c_i^0 A_i^\top A_i}\right) + \frac{\gamma}{2t}\left\|y^* - y^0\right\|^2_{\sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top B_i}.$$

Suppose $\sigma = 0$, i.e., $G_i(x_i) = \nabla f_i(x_i)$ w.p.1 for any x_i and $i \in \mathcal{N}$. When $c_i^k = c_i$ for all $k \geq 0$ for some $c_i \in (0, \frac{1}{L_i + \gamma\sigma_{\max}^2(A_i)}]$, the following bound holds w.p.1 for all $t \geq 1$,

$$F\left(\bar{u}^t\right) - F(u^*) + \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^\top \left(A_i\bar{x}_i^t + B_i\bar{y}^t - b_i\right) \tag{23}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2t}\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{\gamma}\left\|\lambda_i - \lambda_i^0\right\|^2 + \frac{1}{c_i}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^0\right\|^2_{I - \gamma c_i A_i^\top A_i}\right) + \frac{\gamma}{2t}\left\|y^* - y^0\right\|^2_{\sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top B_i}.$$

Proof. Since u^* is a solution to (5), $A_i x_i^* + B_i y^* = b_i$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Hence, for any λ and $\hat{w}$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^\top (b_i - A_i\hat{x}_i - B_i\hat{y}) = \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i^* - \hat{x}_i)^\top A_i^\top \hat{\lambda}_i + (y^* - \hat{y})^\top \sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top \hat{\lambda}_i + \sum_{i=1}^N (\lambda_i - \hat{\lambda}_i)^\top (b_i - A_i\hat{x}_i - B_i\hat{y}).$$

Hence, invoking the convexity of $F(\cdot)$ and using the above equality with $\hat{w} = w^{k+1}$ justify the first inequality and the first equality, respectively, below:

$$\begin{aligned}
&F(\bar{u}^t) - F(u^*) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \lambda_i^\top \left(A_i\bar{x}_i^t + B_i\bar{y}^t - b_i\right) \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=0}^{t-1}\left[F(u^*) - F(u^{k+1}) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \lambda_i^\top \left(b_i - A_i x_i^{k+1} - B_i y^{k+1}\right)\right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2t}\sum_{k=0}^{t-1}\sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{1}{\gamma}\left\|\lambda_i - \lambda_i^k\right\|^2 - \frac{1}{\gamma}\left\|\lambda_i - \lambda_i^{k+1}\right\|^2 + \frac{1}{c_i^k}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^k\right\|^2_{I - \gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i} - \frac{1}{c_i^k}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2_{I - \gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i}\right. \\
&\qquad \left. + \gamma\left\|A_i x_i^* + B_i y^k - b_i\right\|^2 - \gamma\left\|A_i x_i^* + B_i y^{k+1} - b_i\right\|^2 + 2(x_i - x_i^k)^\top \delta_i^k + \frac{\left\|\delta_i^k\right\|^2}{1 + \sqrt{k}}\right] =: \Gamma^t,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 2.

First, consider the PG-ADMM iterate sequence generated using $G_i(x_i^k, \zeta_i^k) = \nabla f_i(x_i^k)$, i.e., $\delta_i^k = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $k \geq 0$. In this setting, according to Lemma 2, we are allowed to fix a constant step size c_i for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Indeed, $c_i^k = c_i := (L_i + \gamma\sigma_{\max}^2(A_i))^{-1}$ for $k \geq 1$. Hence, one obtains the desired result in (23) by showing

$$\Gamma^t \leq \frac{1}{2t}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}\left\|\lambda_i - \lambda_i^0\right\|^2 + \frac{1}{c_i}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^0\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i A_i^\top A_i} + \gamma\left\|y^* - y^0\right\|^2_{B_i^\top B_i}\right),$$

which follows from dropping the non-positive terms after the telescoping sum in the definition of Γ^t is evaluated, and using the fact that $A_i x_i^* + B_i y^* = b_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Next, consider the SPG-ADMM iterate sequence for which $\delta_i^k > 0$ with probability 1 for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $k \geq 0$. In this case, according to Lemma 2, if one sets $c_i^k = \left(L_i + \gamma\sigma_{\max}^2(A_i) + 1 + \sqrt{k}\right)^{-1} > 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $k \geq 0$, then $F(\bar{u}^t) - F(u^*) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \lambda_i^\top \left(A_i\bar{x}_i^t + B_i\bar{y}^t - b_i\right) \leq \Gamma^t$ holds for all $t \geq 1$. Moreover, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2t}\sum_{k=0}^{t-1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{c_i^k}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^k\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i} - \frac{1}{c_i^k}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^k A_i^\top A_i}\\
&= \frac{1}{2t}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{c_i^0}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^0\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^0 A_i^\top A_i} - \frac{1}{c_i^{t-1}}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^t\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^{t-1} A_i^\top A_i} + \sum_{k=0}^{t-1}\left(\sqrt{k+1} - \sqrt{k}\right)\left\|x_i^* - x_i^{k+1}\right\|^2\right)\right]\\
&\leq \frac{ND^2}{2\sqrt{t}} + \frac{1}{2t}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{c_i^0}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^0\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^0 A_i^\top A_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma^t \leq &\frac{ND^2}{2\sqrt{t}} + \frac{1}{2t}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}\left\|\lambda_i - \lambda_i^0\right\|^2 + \frac{1}{c_i^0}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^0\right\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i^0 A_i^\top A_i} + \gamma\left\|y^* - y^0\right\|^2_{B_i^\top B_i}\right)\\
&+ \frac{1}{2t}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{k=0}^{t-1}\left(2(x_i - x_i^k)^\top\delta_i^k + \frac{\left\|\delta_i^k\right\|^2}{1+\sqrt{k}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\zeta^\ell = [\zeta_i^\ell]_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$ for $\ell \geq 0$. Note from (7) it follows that $(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k, \lambda^k)$ are random variables depending only on $\Upsilon^k := \{\zeta^\ell\}_{\ell=0}^{k-1}$ for all $k \geq 1$; hence, $\mathbb{E}_{\zeta^k}[\delta_i^k|\Upsilon^k] = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\zeta^k}\left[\left\|\delta_i^k\right\|^2|\Upsilon^k\right] \leq \sigma^2$ because $\delta_i^k := G_i(x_i^k, \zeta_i^k) - \nabla_i f_i(x_i^k)$. Therefore, for all $k \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\Upsilon^{k+1}}\left[(x_i^k)^\top\delta_i^k\right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\Upsilon^k}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\zeta^k}\left[(x_i^k)^\top\delta_i^k|\Upsilon^k\right]\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\Upsilon^k}\left[(x_i^k)^\top\mathbb{E}_{\zeta^k}[\delta_i^k|\Upsilon^k]\right] = 0,\\
\mathbb{E}_{\Upsilon^{k+1}}\left[\left\|\delta_i^k\right\|^2\right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\Upsilon^k}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\zeta^k}\left[\left\|\delta_i^k\right\|^2|\Upsilon^k\right]\right] \leq \sigma^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, invoking the convexity of function $F(\cdot)$ and using the Jensen's inequality, we obtain the

desired result

$$\begin{aligned} & F(\mathbb{E}[\bar{u}^t]) - F(u^*) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \lambda_i^\top \left(A_i\mathbb{E}[\bar{x}_i^t] + B_i\mathbb{E}[\bar{y}^t] - b_i\right) \\ \leq \quad & \mathbb{E}\left[F(\bar{u}^t) - F(u^*) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \lambda_i^\top \left(A_i\bar{x}_i^t + B_i\bar{y}^t - b_i\right)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma^t\right], \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the upper bound on Γ^t above, and using $\sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \frac{1}{1+\sqrt{k}} \leq \int_0^{t-1} \frac{1}{1+\sqrt{s}} ds \leq \sqrt{t}$. □

Now we are ready to prove the $O(1/t)$ and $O(1/\sqrt{t})$ convergence rates of PG-ADMM stated in (6) and SPG-ADMM stated in (7) in an ergodic sense for solving (5).

Theorem 4. *Under Assumption 1, let $\{w^k\}_{k\geq 1}$ be the iterate sequence generated by SPG-ADMM* (11)-(13) *starting from given w^0; and $\{\bar{u}^k\}_{k\geq 1}$ be the average sequence defined as in Lemma 3. Fix an arbitrary point $(u^*, \lambda_1^*, \ldots, \lambda_N^*) \in \chi^*$.*

Suppose $\sigma = 0$, i.e., $G_i(x_i) = \nabla f_i(x_i)$ w.p.1 for any x_i and $i \in \mathcal{N}$. When $c_i^k = c_i$ for all $k \geq 0$ for some $c_i \in (0, \frac{1}{L_i + \gamma\sigma_{\max}^2(A_i)}]$, the following bounds hold for all $t \geq 1$

$$0 \leq F(\bar{u}^t) - F(u^*) + 2\sum_{i=1}^N \|\lambda_i^*\| \left\|A_i\bar{x}_i^t + B_i\bar{y}^t - b_i\right\| \leq \frac{C(c_1, \ldots, c_N)}{t}, \tag{24}$$

where $C(c_1, \ldots, c_N) := \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{\gamma}\left(4\|\lambda_i^*\|^2 + \|\lambda_i^0\|^2\right) + \frac{1}{2c_i}\|x_i^* - x_i^0\|^2_{I-\gamma c_i A_i^\top A_i}\right) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|y^* - y^0\|^2_{\sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top B_i}$. This implies $O(1/t)$ ergodic convergence rate, i.e., for all $t \geq 1$ both suboptimality and infeasibility satisfy

$$|F(\bar{u}^t) - F(u^*)| = C(c_1, \ldots, c_N)/t, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^N \|\lambda_i^*\| \left\|A_i\bar{x}_i^t + B_i\bar{y}^t - b_i\right\| = C(c_1, \ldots, c_N)/t.$$

Suppose $\sigma > 0$. Fix $c_i = (L_i + \gamma\sigma_{\max}^2(A_i) + 1)^{-1}$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and set $C := C(c_1, \ldots, c_N)$. Let $C' := N(D^2/2 + \sigma^2)$, and $D := \max_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \sup_{x,x'\in\mathbf{dom}(\xi_i)} \|x - x'\|$. When $\{c_i^k\}_k$ sequence is chosen as $c_i^k = \left(\frac{1}{c_i} + \sqrt{k}\right)^{-1}$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, the following bounds hold for all $t \geq 1$:

$$0 \leq F(\mathbb{E}[\bar{u}^t]) - F(u^*) + 2\sum_{i=1}^N \|\lambda_i^*\| \left\|A_i\mathbb{E}[\bar{x}_i^t] + B_i\mathbb{E}[\bar{y}^t] - b_i\right\| \leq \frac{C'}{\sqrt{t}} + \frac{C}{t}, \tag{25}$$

This implies $O(1/\sqrt{t})$ ergodic convergence rate when $D < +\infty$, i.e., for all $t \geq 1$ both suboptimality and infeasibility satisfy

$$|F(\mathbb{E}[\bar{u}^t]) - F(u^*)| = \frac{C'}{\sqrt{t}} + \frac{C}{t}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^N \|\lambda_i^*\| \left\|A_i\mathbb{E}[\bar{x}_i^t] + B_i\mathbb{E}[\bar{y}^t] - b_i\right\| = \frac{C'}{\sqrt{t}} + \frac{C}{t}. \tag{26}$$

Proof. Let $\rho_i := 2\|\lambda_i^*\|$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Since any $(u^*, \lambda^*) \in \chi^*$ is a saddle point of $\mathcal{L}$, it satisfies $\mathcal{L}(u, \lambda^*) \geq \mathcal{L}(u^*, \lambda^*)$ for any $u = (\mathbf{x}, y)$, which can be easily checked using the optimality condition (10). Thus, combining it with the fact that $A_i x_i^* + B_i y^* = b_i$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and using Cauchy-Schwarz results in the following inequality for all $u = (\mathbf{x}, y)$

$$F(u) - F(u^*) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} 2\,\|\lambda_i^*\|\,\|A_i x_i + B_i y - b_i\| \geq F(u) - F(u^*) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} {\lambda_i^*}^{\top}\,(A_i x_i + B_i y - b_i) \geq 0. \tag{27}$$

Hence, by setting $u = \bar{u}^t = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t, \bar{y}^t)$ and $u = \mathbb{E}[\bar{u}^t] = (\mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t], \mathbb{E}[\bar{y}^t])$, we immediately obtain the first inequalities in (24) and (25), respectively.

Note (23) holds for any $\lambda = [\lambda_i]_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$; hence, by setting $\lambda_i = \rho_i\,(A_i\bar{x}_i^t + B_i\bar{y}^t - b_i)\,/\,\|A_i\bar{x}_i^t + B_i\bar{y}^t - b_i\|$ in (23), noting that $\|\lambda_i\| = \rho_i$, and using $\|\lambda_i - \lambda_i^0\|^2/2 \leq \|\lambda_i\|^2 + \|\lambda_i^0\|^2$, we obtain the second inequality in (24), i.e., $F(\bar{u}^t) - F(u^*) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \rho_i\,\|A_i\bar{x}_i^t + B_i\bar{y}^t - b_i\| \leq C(c_1, \ldots, c_N)/t$. Let $\bar{\tau}_i := A_i\bar{x}_i^t + B_i\bar{y}^t - b_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$. From (27) and the above inequality, it follows that

$$-\sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\lambda_i^*\|\|\bar{\tau}_i\| \leq F(\bar{u}^t) - F(u^*) \leq C(c_1, \ldots, c_N)/t - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \rho_i\|\bar{\tau}_i\|.$$

Hence, since $\rho_i := 2\,\|\lambda_i^*\|$, it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\lambda_i^*\|\|\bar{\tau}_i\| \leq \frac{C(c_1,\ldots,c_N)}{t}$. Therefore, one can conclude that $\max\{|F(\bar{u}^t) - F(u^*)|,\ \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\lambda_i^*\|\|A_i\bar{x}_i^t + B_i\bar{y}^t - b_i\|\} \leq \frac{C(c_1,\ldots,c_N)}{t}$.

Using similar arguments as above one can show $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{t})$ rate for the SPG-ADMM. Indeed, observe that (22) holds for any $\lambda = [\lambda_i]_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$; hence, by setting $\lambda_i = \rho_i\,(A_i\mathbb{E}[\bar{x}_i^t] + B_i\mathbb{E}[\bar{y}^t] - b_i)\,/\,\left\|A_i\mathbb{E}[\bar{x}_i^t] + B_i\mathbb{E}[\bar{y}^t] - b_i\right\|$ in (22), noting that $\|\lambda_i\| = \rho_i$, and using $\|\lambda_i - \lambda_i^0\|^2/2 \leq \|\lambda_i\|^2 + \|\lambda_i^0\|^2$, we obtain the second inequality in (25), which clearly implies (26) as discussed above. □

B. Proximal Gradient Methods for Distributed Optimization

In this section, we provide two different formulations of the decentralized optimization problem in (4) and both of them are special cases of (5). Hence, we develop two different distributed implementations of PG-ADMM in (6), one for each formulation; and finally we derive the customized convergence bounds showing the effect of network topology for each implementation. Similarly, one can also implement SPG-ADMM in (7) on the two different decentralized formulations of (4) to obtain the stochastic gradient variants of these distributed algorithms. The error bounds for these stochastic variants can be driven as we obtain the bounds for the deterministic versions using Lemma 3. Due to space considerations, we skip their proofs and only state the error bounds for these variants using stochastic gradients as corollaries of the deterministic error bound results shown in Theorem 5 and Theorem 6.

In the rest of this paper, we adopt the following notation. Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ be a connected graph, where $\mathcal{N} := \{1, \ldots, N\}$ denotes the set of computing nodes, and $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ denote the set of (undirected) edges. Without loss of generality, assume that edges in $\mathcal{E}$ are oriented, i.e., $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$ implies that $i < j$. Let $\mathcal{O}_i := \{j \in \mathcal{N} : \ (i,j) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ or } (j,i) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ denote the set of neighboring nodes of $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and $d_i := |\mathcal{O}_i|$ denote the degree of node $i \in \mathcal{N}$; we also define $\mathcal{N}_i := \mathcal{O}_i \cup \{i\}$. Let $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}| \times |\mathcal{N}|}$ denote the Laplacian of the graph $\mathcal{G}$, and $M \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}| \times |\mathcal{N}|}$ denote the oriented edge-node incidence matrix, i.e., for $e = (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $k \in \mathcal{N}$, M_{ek} is equal to 1 if $k = i$, equal to -1 if $k = j$, and equal to 0, otherwise.

Note that $\Omega = M^\top M$. Let $\psi_{\max} := \psi_1 \geq \psi_2 \geq \ldots \geq \psi_N$ be the eigenvalues of Ω. Since we assumed that $\mathcal{G}$ is *connected*, we have $\psi_{N-1} > \psi_N = 0$. Hence, $\mathbf{rank}(M) = \mathbf{rank}(\Omega) = N - 1$. Moreover, $(M \otimes I_n)^\top (M \otimes I_n) = \Omega \otimes I_n$; and from the structure of $\Omega \otimes I_n$, it follows that $\{\psi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are also the eigenvalues of $\Omega \otimes I_n$, each with *algebraic multiplicity* n. Thus, $R := \mathbf{rank}(M \otimes I_n) = n(N-1)$. Let $M \otimes I_n = U \Sigma V^\top$ denote the reduced singular value decomposition (SVD) of $M \otimes I_n$, where $U = [u_1 \ldots u_R] \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{E}| \times R}$, $V = [v_1 \ldots v_R] \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}| \times R}$, $\Sigma = \mathbf{diag}(\sigma)$, and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^R_{++}$. Note that $\sigma_{\max}(M \otimes I_n) = \max\{\sigma_r : \ r = 1, \ldots, R\} = \sqrt{\psi_1}$, and $\sigma_{\min}(M \otimes I_n) = \min\{\sigma_r : \ r = 1, \ldots, R\} = \sqrt{\psi_{N-1}}$.

1) DPGA-I Algorithm: The first formulation that is suitable for implementing PG-ADMM in (6) or SPG-ADMM in (7) follows from [15] using communication matrices. In particular, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}| \times |\mathcal{N}|}$ is called a *communication matrix* if for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $C_{ij} = 0$ for all $j \notin \mathcal{N}_i$, $C_{ij} < 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{O}_i$, and $C_{ii} = -\sum_{j \in \mathcal{O}_i} C_{ij}$. It is easy to show that for $\mathbf{x} = [x_i]_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}$ satisfying $(C \otimes I_n)\, \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$, we have $x_i = \bar{x}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ for some $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\otimes$ denotes the Kronecker product. Therefore, given C with properties above, the feasible set in (4) can be equivalently represented as $\{\mathbf{x} = [x_i]_{i \in \mathcal{N}} : \ (C \otimes I_n)\, \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}\}$. Note that the Laplacian Ω of the graph $\mathcal{G}$ is a *communication matrix*. Hence, (4) can be equivalently written as

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}} \Big\{ F(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Phi_i(x_i) : \ (\Omega \otimes I_n)\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0} \Big\}, \tag{28}$$

where $\mathbf{x}^\top = [x_1^\top, \ldots, x_N^\top]^\top$ and Φ_i is defined in (1). Here, we derive the algorithm and its convergence bounds by setting $C = \Omega$ (it is worth emphasizing that the same arguments used here also work for any general communication matrix, resulting in the same error bounds with slightly different $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constants). In the rest of this section, assume that (3) has a solution, and (28) satisfies Assumption 2.

For each $i \in \mathcal{N}$, define new set of primal variables $y_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$, and form $\mathbf{y}_i := [y_{ij}]_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d_i+1)n}$. Let $\mathcal{Y}_i := \{\mathbf{y}_i : \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} y_{ij} = \mathbf{0}\}$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and define $g(\mathbf{y}) := \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Y}_i}(\mathbf{y}_i)$, where $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Y}_i}$ denotes the indicator function of the set $\mathcal{Y}_i$, i.e., $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Y}_i}(\mathbf{y}_i)$ is equal to 0 if $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i$, and to $+\infty$ otherwise, where $\mathbf{y}^\mathsf{T} = [\mathbf{y}_1^\mathsf{T}, \ldots, \mathbf{y}_N^\mathsf{T}]$. Hence, following the insight of [15], consider the following equivalent formulation:

$$\min_{\mathbf{y},\{x_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}} \quad g(\mathbf{y}) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \Phi_i(x_i) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \Omega_{ij}x_j - y_{ij} = 0 : \ \lambda_{ij}, \quad \forall\ j \in \mathcal{N}_i,\ \forall\ i \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{29}$$

where $\lambda_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the Lagrange multiplier corresponding to the primal constraint $\Omega_{ij}x_j - y_{ij} = 0$ in (29). Similar to the definition of $\mathbf{y}_i$, let $\lambda_i = [\lambda_{ij}]_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d_i+1)n}$, and $\lambda = [\lambda_i]_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n(2|\mathcal{E}|+|\mathcal{N}|)}$.

It is important to note that the formulation (29) is a special case of (5), and one can employ PG-ADMM or SPG-ADMM to solve (29). In the rest, we focus on the implementation details of PG-ADMM. Indeed, it can be easily observed that A_i of (5) takes the following form for (29): $A_i = (\omega_i \otimes I_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n(d_i+1)\times n}$, where $\omega_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i+1}$ is obtained from the i-th column of Ω after 0 entries are removed without changing the order of non-zero entries. Furthermore, it can also be easily observed that $\sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top B_i$ in Lemma 3 is equal to $I_{n(2|\mathcal{E}|+|\mathcal{N}|)}$ for the constraint matrix structure in (29); therefore, $\|\mathbf{y}^* - \mathbf{y}^0\|_{\sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top B_i} = \|\mathbf{y}^* - \mathbf{y}^0\|$. For all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, we set the stepsize c_i to its upper bound given in Lemma 3, i.e., $c_i = 1/(L_i + \gamma\sigma_{\max}^2(A_i))$. Since $\sigma_{\max}(A_i) = \sqrt{d_i^2 + d_i}$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ for the formulation (29), this corresponds to setting $c_i := 1/(L_i + \gamma d_i(d_i+1))$.

The smooth part of the augmented Lagrangian ϕ_γ for the formulation (29) can be written as

$$\phi_\gamma(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\lambda) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \left[f_i(x_i) + \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \lambda_{ij}^\top(\Omega_{ij}x_j - y_{ij}) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \|\Omega_{ij}x_j - y_{ij}\|^2 \right],$$

for a fixed penalty parameter $\gamma > 0$; hence, $\nabla_{x_j}\phi_\gamma$ can be computed as

$$\nabla_{x_j}\phi_\gamma(\mathbf{x}^k,\mathbf{y}^k,\lambda^k) = \nabla f(x_j^k) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j} \left[\Omega_{ij}\lambda_{ij}^k + \gamma\Omega_{ij}(\Omega_{ij}x_j^k - y_{ij}^k)\right]$$

and the steps of PG-ADMM in (6) take the following form:

$$x_j^{k+1} = \mathbf{prox}_{c_j\xi_j}\left(x_j^k - c_j\nabla_{x_j}\phi_\gamma(\mathbf{x}^k,\mathbf{y}^k,\lambda^k)\right), \quad j \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{30}$$

$$\mathbf{y}_i^{k+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{y}_i} \left\{ \frac{\gamma}{2}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \left\| \Omega_{ij}x_j^{k+1} - y_{ij} + \frac{1}{\gamma}\lambda_{ij}^k \right\|^2 : \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} y_{ij} = 0 \right\}, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{31}$$

$$\lambda_{ij}^{k+1} = \lambda_{ij}^k + \gamma\left(\Omega_{ij}x_j^{k+1} - y_{ij}^{k+1}\right), \quad j \in \mathcal{N}_i,\ i \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{32}$$

Except for x-step in (30), the y-step in (31) and λ-step in (32) are exactly the same as those in [15]. Instead of taking proximal gradient step, x_j^{k+1} is computed in [15] by solving $\min_{x_j \in \mathbb{R}^n} \Phi_j(x_j) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} {\lambda_{ij}^k}^\top (\Omega_{ij}\, x_j - y_{ij}^k) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \left\| \Omega_{ij} x_j - y_{ij}^k \right\|^2$, which is equivalent to computing $\mathbf{prox}_{\xi_j + f_j}$. Note that even if both ξ_j and f_j have simple prox maps, the prox map of the sum is not necessarily simple and it can be impractical to compute.

Since y-step and λ-step are the same as those in [15], the results of this paragraph directly follow from Section III of [15]. Let $\{x_i^0\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}}$ denote the set of initial primal iterates. For $k \geq 0$, let p_i^{k+1} be the optimal Lagrange multiplier corresponding to $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i$ constraint in (31); hence, $y_{ij}^{k+1} = \Omega_{ij} x_j^{k+1} + \frac{1}{\gamma}(\lambda_{ij}^k - p_i^{k+1})$. On the other hand, combining this equality with (32), we conclude that $\lambda_{ij}^{k+1} = p_i^{k+1}$ for all $k \geq 0$. Moreover, since $\mathbf{y}_i^{k+1} \in \mathcal{Y}_i$, the optimal dual can be computed in closed form: $p_i^{k+1} = \frac{1}{d_i+1} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \lambda_{ij}^k + \frac{\gamma}{d_i+1} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Omega_{ij} x_j^{k+1}$ for $k \geq 0$. Suppose that we initialize $\lambda_{ij}^0 = p_i^0$ for all $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ for some given p_i^0 for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Thus, $p_i^{k+1} = p_i^k + \frac{\gamma}{d_i+1} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Omega_{ij} x_j^{k+1}$ for all $k \geq 0$. Finally, by defining $s_i^0 = 0$ and $s_i^k := \frac{1}{d_i+1} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Omega_{ij} x_j^k$ for $k \geq 1$, and initializing $y_{ij}^0 := \Omega_{ij} x_j^0$ for all $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$, the computation of $\nabla_{x_j} \phi_\gamma$ in step (30) can be simplified. Indeed,

$$\nabla_{x_j} \phi_\gamma(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k, \lambda^k) - \nabla f_j(x_j^k) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \Omega_{ij} \left(\lambda_{ij}^k + \gamma(\Omega_{ij} x_j^k - y_{ij}^k) \right) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \Omega_{ij} \left(2p_i^k - p_i^{k-1} \right) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \Omega_{ij} \left(p_i^k + \gamma s_i^k \right).$$

holds for $k \geq 0$. Note that this is true for $k = 0$ because of how we initialize λ^0 and $\mathbf{y}^0$. Therefore, the steps in (30)-(32) can be simplified as shown in Figure 1 below.

Algorithm DPGA-I ($\gamma, \mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{p}^0$)

Initialization: $c_i = (L_i + \gamma d_i (d_i + 1))^{-1}, \quad s_i^0 = \mathbf{0}, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}$

Step k: ($k \geq 0$) For $i \in \mathcal{N}$ compute

1. $x_i^{k+1} = \mathbf{prox}_{c_i \xi_i} \left(x_i^k - c_i \left(\nabla f_i(x_i^k) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Omega_{ij} (p_j^k + \gamma s_j^k) \right) \right), \quad i \in \mathcal{N}$
2. $s_i^{k+1} = \frac{1}{d_i+1} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Omega_{ij} x_j^{k+1}, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}$
3. $p_i^{k+1} = p_i^k + \gamma s_i^{k+1}, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}$

Fig. 1. Distributed Proximal Gradient Algorithm I (DPGA-I)

The algorithm works in the following distributed fashion: i) each node stores three variables in $\mathbb{R}^n$: x_i^k, s_i^k and p_i^k; ii) each node sends out its $p_i^k + \gamma s_i^k$ to all its neighbors, and computes the proximal step; iii) after the computation of proximal steps, each node broadcasts the updated variable x_i^{k+1}, and then updates s_i^{k+1}; iv) each node updates p_i^{k+1}, and then repeats.

2) Error Bounds for DPGA-I & Effect of Network Topology: In this section, we examine the effect of network topology on the convergence rate of DPGA-I, which is nothing but PG-

ADMM customized to the decentralized formulation in (29) as discussed in Section II-B1. To obtain simple $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constants in the error bounds, we set $p_i^0 = \mathbf{0}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Theorem 5. *Given arbitrary $\mathbf{x}^0$ and $\gamma > 0$, let $p_i^0 = \mathbf{0}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}_{k\geq 1}$ be the DPGA-I iterate sequence, generated as shown in Figure 1. The average sequence $\{\bar{x}^t\}_{t\geq 1}$, defined as $\bar{x}_i^t = (\sum_{k=1}^t x_i^k)/t$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $t \geq 1$, converges to an optimal solution to* (4) *with the following suboptimality and infeasibility bounds satisfied for all $t \geq 1$,*

$$-\frac{1}{t}\left(\frac{2(d_{\max}+1)}{\gamma\sigma_{\min}^2(\Omega)}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\kappa_i^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{2c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right) \leq F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F^* \leq \frac{1}{t}\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{2c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right),$$

$$\left\|(\Omega\otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\right\| \leq \frac{1}{t}\left(\frac{d_{\max}+1}{\gamma\sigma_{\min}^2(\Omega)}\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\kappa_i^2 + \sigma_{\min}^2(\Omega)\right) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{2c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right),$$

where $\kappa_i > 0$ denotes an upper bound on the elements of $\partial\Phi_i(x^*)$, i.e., if $q \in \partial\Phi_i(x^*)$, then $\|q\| \leq \kappa_i$, for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Proof. Suppose that a solution to (3) exists; then $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an optimal solution to (3) if and only if $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}$ such that $x_i^* = x^*$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is optimal to (28), and $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ such that $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n(2|\mathcal{E}|+|\mathcal{N}|)}$ and $y_{ij}^* = \Omega_{ij}x^*$ for all $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is optimal to (29). The formulation (28), which is equivalent to (29), can also be written as

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}}\left\{\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\Phi_i(x_i) : \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\Omega_{ij}x_j = \mathbf{0} : p_i \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}\right\}, \tag{33}$$

where $p_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the dual variable corresponding to the primal constraint for $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Recall that we assume (28) satisfies Assumption 2; hence, there exists a primal-dual optimal pair $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{p}^*)$ for (28), where $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}$ such that $x_i^* = x^*$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathbf{p}^* := [p_i^*]_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$. Note that Assumption 2 is satisfied if Slater's condition holds, i.e., $\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\mathbf{ri}(\mathbf{dom}\,\xi_i) \neq \emptyset$.

From the first-order optimality conditions for (33), $\mathbf{p}^* := [p_i^*]_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$ is an optimal dual solution to (33) if and only if

$$\mathbf{0} \in \partial\Phi_j(x^*) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j}\Omega_{ij}p_i^*, \quad \forall\ j \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{34}$$

i.e., $-(\Omega\otimes I_n)^\top\mathbf{p}^* \in \partial F(\mathbf{x}^*)$ and $x_i^* = x^*$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, where $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an optimal solution to (3). Moreover, according to the first-order optimality conditions for (29), $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n(2|\mathcal{E}|+|\mathcal{N}|)}$ is dual optimal to (29) if and only if there exists some $\mathbf{p} = [p_i]_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$ such that $\lambda_{ij}^* = p_i$ for all $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and $\mathbf{0} \in \partial\Phi_j(x^*) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j}\Omega_{ij}\lambda_{ij}^*$ for all $j \in \mathcal{N}$. Therefore, given $\mathbf{p}^*$ an optimal dual solution to (33), one can construct a dual optimal solution λ^* to (29) by simply setting $\lambda_{ij}^* = p_i^*$

for all $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$. In the rest of the proof, fix $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{p}^* = [p_i^*]_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$ such that x^* is an optimal solution to (3), and $\mathbf{p}^*$ is a dual solution to (33); thus, $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*, \lambda^*)$ is a primal-dual optimal solution to (29), where $x_i^* = x^*$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $y_{ij}^* = \Omega_{ij}x^*$ and $\lambda_{ij}^* = p_i^*$ for $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Since $A_i = (\omega_i \otimes I_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n(d_i+1)\times n}$, where $\omega_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i+1}$ is the i-th column of Ω after 0 entries are removed, $A_i^\top A_i = d_i(d_i+1)I_n$; hence, $c_i = 1/(L_i + \gamma d_i(d_i+1))$ implies that $\frac{1}{c_i}\left\|x_i^0 - x^*\right\|_{I_n - \gamma c_i A_i^\top A_i} = L_i\left\|x_i^0 - x^*\right\|^2$. We also have $\sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top B_i = I_{n(2|\mathcal{E}|+|\mathcal{N}|)}$, and since we initialize $\mathbf{y}^0$ such that $y_{ij}^0 = \Omega_{ij}x_j^0$, and $y_{ij}^* = \Omega_{ij}x^*$, for all $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$, it trivially follows that $\left\|\mathbf{y}^* - \mathbf{y}^0\right\|^2_{\sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top B_i} = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\Omega_{ij}^2\left\|x^* - x_j^0\right\|^2 = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} d_i(d_i+1)\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2$.

Furthermore, Lemma 3 holds for all $\lambda = [\lambda_i]_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n(2|\mathcal{E}|+|\mathcal{N}|)}$, where $\lambda_i = [\lambda_{ij}]_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n(d_i+1)}$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Hence, given $\mathbf{p}^\top = [p_1^\top, \ldots, p_N^\top]^\top$ for some $p_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, we set $\lambda_{ij} = p_i$ for all $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and invoke Lemma 3 for this specific choice of λ to obtain the following inequality, customized for (29), for all $t \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} F(\bar{x}^t) - F^* + \mathbf{p}^\top(\Omega \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t &= F(\bar{x}^t) - F^* + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} p_i^\top(\Omega_{ij}\bar{x}_j^t - \bar{y}_{ij}^t) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2t}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\left(\frac{d_i+1}{\gamma}\left\|p_i\right\|^2 + \frac{1}{c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right), \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where the inequality follows from the facts that $\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\bar{y}_{ij}^t = \mathbf{0}$ and $c_i = (L_i + \gamma d_i(d_i+1))^{-1}$. Hence, setting $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0}$ in (35) leads to

$$F(\bar{x}^t) - F^* \leq \frac{1}{t}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{2c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2. \tag{36}$$

From the convexity of Φ_i, (34) and the fact $(\Omega \otimes I_n)\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{0}$, it follows that

$$0 \leq F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F^* + {\mathbf{p}^*}^\mathsf{T}(\Omega \otimes I_n)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t - \mathbf{x}^*) = F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F^* + {\mathbf{p}^*}^\mathsf{T}(\Omega \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t. \tag{37}$$

Adding the last term to both sides, and invoking (35) for $\mathbf{p}$ such that $p_i = 2p_i^*$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} {\mathbf{p}^*}^\mathsf{T}(\Omega \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t &\leq F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F^* + (2\mathbf{p}^*)^\mathsf{T}(\Omega \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2t}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\left(\frac{d_i+1}{\gamma}\left\|2p_i^*\right\|^2 + \frac{1}{c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right), \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t}\left(\frac{2(d_{\max}+1)}{\gamma}\left\|\mathbf{p}^*\right\|^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{2c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right). \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Invoking (35) once again for $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}^* + (\Omega \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t / \left\|(\Omega \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\right\|$ and using (37), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|(\Omega \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\right\| &\leq F(\bar{x}^t) - F^* + \mathbf{p}^{*\mathsf{T}}(\Omega \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t + \left\|(\Omega \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2t}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\left(\frac{d_i+1}{\gamma}\left\|p_i^* + \frac{\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\Omega_{ij}\bar{x}_j^t}{\left\|(\Omega \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\right\|}\right\|^2 + \frac{1}{c_i}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t}\left(\frac{d_{\max}+1}{\gamma}(1+\|\mathbf{p}^*\|^2) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{2c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right), \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where the last inequality follows from $\|a+b\|^2 \leq 2\|a\|^2 + 2\|b\|^2$. Next, appropriately choosing a dual optimal to (33), we bound $\|\mathbf{p}^*\|$, which appears in (38) and (39).

Since $\mathcal{G}$ is connected, $\mathbf{rank}(\Omega) = N-1$ and $\psi_1 \geq \ldots \geq \psi_{N-1} > \psi_N = 0$, where $\{\psi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ denote the eigenvalues of the graph Laplacian $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}|\times|\mathcal{N}|}$. From the definitions given at the beginning of Section II-B, given the SVD of $(M \otimes I_n)$, the eigenvalue decomposition of $(\Omega \otimes I_n)$ can be written as $V\Sigma^2 V^\top$, where $V = [v_1 \ldots v_R] \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|\times R}$, $\Sigma = \mathbf{diag}(\sigma)$, and $R := \mathbf{rank}(\Omega \otimes I_n) = n(N-1)$. Note that $\max\{\sigma_r^2 : \ r = 1,\ldots,R\} = \psi_1$, and $\min\{\sigma_r^2 : \ r = 1,\ldots,R\} = \psi_{N-1} > 0$. Since $(\Omega \otimes I_n)^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{p}^*$ is in the row space of $(\Omega \otimes I_n)$, there exists $\{\lambda_r\}_{r=1}^R$ such that $-(\Omega \otimes I_n)^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{p}^* = \sum_{r=1}^R \lambda_r v_r$. Following [15], choose $\bar{\mathbf{p}} := \sum_{r=1}^R v_r\lambda_r/\sigma_r^2 = V\,\mathbf{diag}(\lambda/\sigma^2)$, where $\mathbf{diag}(\lambda/\sigma^2) \in \mathbb{R}^{R\times R}$ is a diagonal matrix with its r-th diagonal entry is λ_r/σ_r^2 for $r = 1,\ldots,R$. Hence, $\bar{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}$ satisfies $-(\Omega \otimes I_n)^\mathsf{T}\bar{\mathbf{p}} = V\Sigma^2V^\mathsf{T}V\,\mathbf{diag}(\lambda/\sigma^2) = -(\Omega \otimes I_n)^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{p}^*$; therefore, $-(\Omega \otimes I_n)^\mathsf{T}\bar{\mathbf{p}} \in \partial F(\mathbf{x}^*)$ as well. Using the local bounds κ_i on the subdifferential of each Φ_i at $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we can bound $\|\bar{\mathbf{p}}\|$ from above as follows:

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{p}}\|^2 = \sum_{r=1}^R\left(\frac{\lambda_r}{\sigma_r^2}\right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{\psi_{N-1}^2}\sum_{r=1}^R\lambda_r^2 = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}^2(\Omega)}\left\|(\Omega \otimes I_n)^\top\mathbf{p}^*\right\|^2.$$

Hence, we can conclude that

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{p}}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}^2(\Omega)}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\kappa_i^2. \tag{40}$$

Note $\sigma_{\min}(\Omega) = \psi_{N-1}^2$. Using (40) within (38) and (39), and combining the resulting inequalities together with (37) and (36) implies the desired bounds. □

When $\mathbf{x}^0$ is chosen such that $x_i^0 = \mathbf{0}$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, the bounds in Theorem 5 can be simplified further. Indeed, observe that $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2 = \left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}L_i + \gamma d_i(d_i+1)\right)\|x^*\|^2 = (\gamma\|\Omega\|_F^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}L_i)\|x^*\|^2$. Therefore, for $t \geq 1$,

$$\max\left\{|F(\bar{x}^t) - F^*|,\ \left\|(\Omega \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\right\|\right\} \leq \frac{1}{2t}\Big[\frac{4(d_{\max}+1)}{\gamma}\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{\kappa_i^2}{\sigma_{\min}^2(\Omega)} + 1\right) + \Big(\gamma\|\Omega\|_F^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}L_i\Big)\|x^*\|^2\Big].$$

3) DPGA-II Algorithm: Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}|\times|\mathcal{N}|}$ be the oriented edge-node incidence matrix of $\mathcal{G}$, defined at the beginning of this section. Then (4) can be written as

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}} \Big\{ F(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \Phi_i(x_i) : \ (M \otimes I_n)\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0} \Big\}, \tag{41}$$

where $\mathbf{x}^\top = [x_1^\top, \ldots, x_N^\top]^\top$ and Φ_i is defined in (1). In the rest of this section, assume that (3) has a solution, and (41) satisfies Assumption 2.

For each $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$, define new set of primal variables $y_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and let $\mathbf{y} = [y_{ij}]_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{E}|}$. Now consider the following equivalent formulation:

$$\min_{\mathbf{y},\ \{x_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}} \left\{ \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \Phi_i(x_i) : \ x_i - y_{ij} = 0 : \alpha_{ij}, \quad x_j - y_{ij} = 0 : \beta_{ij}, \quad \forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{E} \right\}, \tag{42}$$

where $\alpha_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\beta_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the Lagrange multiplier vectors corresponding to the primal constraints $x_i - y_{ij} = 0$, and $x_j - y_{ij} = 0$ in (42). Similarly, define $\alpha = [\alpha_{ij}]_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{E}|}$, and $\beta = [\beta_{ij}]_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{E}|}$.

Note that the formulation (42) is also a special case of (5) with $g(\mathbf{y}) = 0$, and one can employ PG-ADMM or SPG-ADMM to solve (42). In the rest, we focus on the implementation details of PG-ADMM. Indeed, it can be easily observed that A_i of (5) takes the following form for (42): $A_i = (\mathbf{1} \otimes I_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_i \times n}$, where $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ is a vector of all ones. Furthermore, it can also be easily observed that $\sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top B_i$ in Lemma 3 is equal to $2I_{n|\mathcal{E}|}$ for (42). For all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, we set the stepsize c_i to its upper bound given in Lemma 3, i.e., $c_i = 1/(L_i + \gamma\sigma_{\max}^2(A_i))$. Hence, for the formulation (42), this corresponds to setting $c_i = 1/(L_i + \gamma d_i)$ since $\sigma_{\max}(A_i) = \sqrt{d_i}$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

The smooth part of the augmented Lagrangian ϕ_γ corresponding to the formulation (42) can be written as

$$\phi_\gamma(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} f_i(x_i) + \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \left(\alpha_{ij}^\top (x_i - y_{ij}) + \beta_{ij}^\top (x_j - y_{ij}) \right) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \left(\|x_i - y_{ij}\|^2 + \|x_j - y_{ij}\|^2 \right)$$

for a fixed penalty parameter $\gamma > 0$; hence, $\nabla_{x_i}\phi_\gamma$ can be computed as

$$\nabla_{x_i}\phi_\gamma(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k, \alpha^k, \beta^k) = \nabla f(x_i^k) + \sum_{j:(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \left(\alpha_{ij}^k + \gamma(x_i^k - y_{ij}^k) \right) + \sum_{j:(j,i)\in\mathcal{E}} \left(\beta_{ji}^k + \gamma(x_i^k - y_{ji}^k) \right) \tag{43}$$

and the steps of PG-ADMM in (6) take the following form:

$$x_j^{k+1} = \mathbf{prox}_{c_j\xi_j} \left(x_j^k - c_j \nabla_{x_j}\phi_\gamma(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k, \alpha^k, \beta^k) \right), \quad j \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{44}$$

$$y_{ij}^{k+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{y_{ij}} \left\{ -\left(\alpha_{ij}^k + \beta_{ij}^k\right)^\top y_{ij} + \frac{\gamma}{2} \left(\left\|x_i^{k+1} - y_{ij}\right\|^2 + \left\|x_j^{k+1} - y_{ij}\right\|^2 \right) \right\}, \quad (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}, \tag{45}$$

$$\alpha_{ij}^{k+1} = \alpha_{ij}^{k} + \gamma\left(x_i^{k+1} - y_{ij}^{k+1}\right), \quad (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}, \tag{46}$$

$$\beta_{ij}^{k+1} = \beta_{ij}^{k} + \gamma\left(x_j^{k+1} - y_{ij}^{k+1}\right), \quad (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}. \tag{47}$$

Let $\{x_i^0\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$ denote the set of initial primal iterates. For $k \geq 0$, (45) can be solved in closed form:

$$y_{ij}^{k+1} = \frac{\alpha_{ij}^k + \beta_{ij}^k}{2\gamma} + \frac{x_i^{k+1} + x_j^{k+1}}{2}. \tag{48}$$

On the other hand, from (46) and (47), it follows that for $k \geq 0$

$$\frac{\alpha_{ij}^{k+1} + \beta_{ij}^{k+1}}{2\gamma} = \frac{\alpha_{ij}^k + \beta_{ij}^k}{2\gamma} + \frac{x_i^{k+1} + x_j^{k+1}}{2} - y_{ij}^{k+1} = 0.$$

Hence, for each $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$, we have $\alpha_{ij}^k + \beta_{ij}^k = 0$ for $k \geq 1$. Suppose we initialize $\alpha^0 = \beta^0 = \mathbf{0}$, i.e., $\alpha_{ij}^0 = \beta_{ij}^0 = 0$ for all $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$. Therefore, using (48), we can conclude that for each $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$, $y_{ij}^k = (x_i^k + x_j^k)/2$ for all $k \geq 1$. Hence, $\alpha_{ij}^k = \frac{\gamma}{2}\sum_{\ell=1}^k \left(x_i^\ell - x_j^\ell\right)$, and $\beta_{ij}^k = \frac{\gamma}{2}\sum_{\ell=1}^k \left(x_j^\ell - x_i^\ell\right)$ for all $k \geq 1$. Therefore, combining these recursions, (43) can be computed for all $k \geq 1$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{x_i}\phi_\gamma(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k, \alpha^k, \beta^k) &= \nabla f(x_i^k) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{O}_i}(x_i^k - x_j^k) + \sum_{j:(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \alpha_{ij}^k + \sum_{j:(j,i)\in\mathcal{E}} \beta_{ji}^k, \\
&= \nabla f(x_i^k) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\left[\sum_{j\in\mathcal{O}_i}(x_i^k - x_j^k) + \sum_{\ell=1}^k\sum_{j\in\mathcal{O}_i}(x_i^\ell - x_j^\ell)\right], \\
&= \nabla f(x_i^k) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\left[\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\Omega_{ij}x_j^k + \sum_{\ell=1}^k\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\Omega_{ij}x_j^\ell\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Finally, by initializing $y_{ij}^0 = (x_i^0 + x_j^0)/2$ for all $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$, the computation of $\nabla_{x_j}\phi_\gamma$ in step (44) can be simplified. Indeed, define $s_i^k := \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\Omega_{ij}x_j^k$ for $k \geq 0$; and let $p_i^k := \gamma\sum_{\ell=1}^k s_i^k$ for $k \geq 1$ and $p_i^0 = \mathbf{0}$. This initialization and (49) together imply that for $k \geq 0$

$$\nabla_{x_i}\phi_\gamma(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{z}^k, \lambda^k) = \nabla f_i(x_i^k) + \frac{1}{2}\left(p_i^k + \gamma s_i^k\right).$$

Therefore, the steps in (44)-(47) can be simplified as shown in Figure 2 below.

Algorithm DPGA-II ($\gamma, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}$)

Initialization: $c_i = (L_i + \gamma d_i)^{-1}$, $\quad s_i^0 = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\Omega_{ij}x_j^0$, $\quad p_i^0 = \mathbf{0}$, $\quad i \in \mathcal{N}$

Step k: ($k \geq 0$) For $i \in \mathcal{N}$ compute

1. $x_i^{k+1} = \mathbf{prox}_{c_i\xi_i}\Big(x_i^k - c_i\big(\nabla f_i(x_i^k) + \frac{1}{2}(p_i^k + \gamma s_i^k)\big)\Big), \quad i \in \mathcal{N}$
2. $s_i^{k+1} = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\Omega_{ij}x_j^{k+1}, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}$
3. $p_i^{k+1} = p_i^k + \gamma s_i^{k+1}, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}$

Fig. 2. Distributed Proximal Gradient Algorithm II (DPGA-II)

4) Error Bounds for DPGA-II & Effect of Topology: In this section, we examine the effect of network topology on the convergence rate of DPGA-II, which is nothing but PG-ADMM customized to the decentralized formulation in (42) as discussed in Section II-B3. To obtain simple $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constants in the error bounds, we set $\alpha_{ij}^0 = \beta_{ij}^0 = \mathbf{0}$ for all $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$.

Theorem 6. *Given arbitrary $\mathbf{x}^0$ and $\gamma > 0$, let $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}_{k\geq 1}$ be the DPGA-II iterate sequence, generated as shown in Figure 2. The average sequence $\{\bar{x}^t\}_{t\geq 1}$, defined as $\bar{x}_i^t = (\sum_{k=1}^t x_i^k)/t$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $t \geq 1$, converges to an optimal solution to* (4) *with the following suboptimality and infeasibility bounds satisfied for all $t \geq 1$,*

$$-\frac{1}{t}\left(\frac{4}{\gamma\sigma_{\min}(\Omega)}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\kappa_i^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{2c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right) \leq F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F^* \leq \frac{1}{t}\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{2c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right),$$

$$\left(\sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}}\left\|\bar{x}_i^t - \bar{x}_j^t\right\|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{t}\left(\frac{2}{\gamma\sigma_{\min}(\Omega)}\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\kappa_i^2 + \sigma_{\min}(\Omega)\right) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{2c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right),$$

where $\kappa_i > 0$ denotes an upper bound on the elements of $\partial\Phi_i(x^*)$, i.e., if $q \in \partial\Phi_i(x^*)$, then $\|q\| \leq \kappa_i$, for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Proof. Suppose a solution to (3) exists; then $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an optimal solution to (3) if and only if $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}$ such that $x_i^* = x^*$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is optimal to (41), and $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ is optimal to (42) for $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{E}|}$ such that $y_{ij}^* = x^*$ for all $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$. The formulation (41), equivalent to (42), can be written as

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}}\{F(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\Phi_i(x_i) :\ x_i - x_j = \mathbf{0} : \theta_{ij},\ (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}, \tag{50}$$

where $\theta_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the dual variable corresponding to the primal constraint $x_i - x_j = \mathbf{0}$. Recall that we assume (41) satisfies Assumption 2; hence, there exists a primal-dual optimal pair $(\mathbf{x}^*, \theta^*)$ for (41), where $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}$ such that $x_i^* = x^*$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\theta^* := [\theta_{ij}^*]_{(ij)\in\mathcal{E}}$. Note that Assumption 2 is satisfied if Slater's condition holds, i.e., $\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\mathbf{ri}(\mathbf{dom}\,\xi_i) \neq \emptyset$.

According to optimality conditions for (50), $\theta^* := [\theta_{ij}^*]_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}}$ is an optimal dual solution to (50) if and only if

$$\mathbf{0} \in \partial\Phi_i(x^*) + \sum_{j:(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}}\theta_{ij}^* - \sum_{j:(j,i)\in\mathcal{E}}\theta_{ji}^*, \quad \forall\ i \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{51}$$

i.e., $-(M \otimes I_n)^\top\theta^* \in F(\mathbf{x}^*)$ and $x_i^* = x^*$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, where $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an optimal solution to (3). Similarly, according to first order optimality conditions for (42), $\alpha^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{E}|}$ and $\beta^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{E}|}$

are dual optimals to (42) if and only if

$$\mathbf{0} \in \partial\Phi_i(x^*) + \sum_{j:(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \alpha^*_{ij} + \sum_{j:(j,i)\in\mathcal{E}} \beta^*_{ji}, \quad \forall\ i \in \mathcal{N},$$

and $\alpha^*_{ij} + \beta^*_{ij} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \forall\ (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$.

Therefore, given $\theta^* := [\theta^*_{ij}]_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}}$ an optimal dual solution to (50), one can construct a dual optimal solution (α^*, β^*) to (42) by simply setting $\alpha^* = \theta^*$ and $\beta^* = -\theta^*$. In the rest of the proof, fix $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\theta^* = [\theta^*_{ij}]_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}}$ such that x^* is an optimal solution to (3), and θ^* is a dual solution to (50); thus, $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*, \alpha^*, \beta^*)$ is a primal-dual optimal solution to (42), where $x^*_i = x^*$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $y^*_{ij} = x^*$, $\alpha^*_{ij} = \theta^*_{ij}$ and $\beta^*_{ij} = -\theta^*_{ij}$ for all $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$.

For $i \in \mathcal{N}$, since $A_i = (\mathbf{1} \otimes I_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_i \times n}$, where $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ is a vector of all ones, $A_i^\top A_i = d_i I_n$; hence, $c_i = 1/(L_i + \gamma d_i)$ implies that $I_n - \gamma c_i A_i^\top A_i = \frac{L_i}{L_i+\gamma d_i} I_n$, which leads to $\frac{1}{c_i}\left\|x^0_i - x^*\right\|_{I_n - \gamma c_i A_i^\top A_i} = L_i \left\|x^0_i - x^*\right\|^2$. Also $\sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top B_i = 2I_{n|\mathcal{E}|}$; and since we initialize $\mathbf{y}^0$ such that $y^0_{ij} = (x^0_i + x^0_j)/2$ and $y^*_{ij} = x^*$ for all $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$, it trivially follows that

$$\left\|\mathbf{y}^* - \mathbf{y}^0\right\|^2_{\sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top B_i} = 2 \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \left\|x^* - (x^0_i + x^0_j)/2\right\|^2 \le \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \left(\left\|x^* - x^0_i\right\|^2 + \left\|x^* - x^0_j\right\|^2\right) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} d_i \left\|x^* - x^0_i\right\|^2.$$

Recall that we initialize $\alpha^0 = \beta^0 = \mathbf{0}$. Furthermore, Lemma 3 holds for all $\alpha = [\alpha_{ij}]_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{E}|}$ and $\beta = [\beta_{ij}]_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{E}|}$, where $\alpha_{ij}, \beta_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$. Hence, given $\theta = [\theta_{ij}]_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}}$ for some $\theta_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for all $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$, we set $\alpha_{ij} = \theta_{ij}$ and $\beta_{ij} = -\theta_{ij}$ for all $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$, and invoke Lemma 3 for this specific choice of $\alpha = \theta$ and $\beta = -\theta$ to obtain the following inequality, customized for (29): for all θ and $t \ge 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\bar{x}^t) - F^* + \theta^\mathsf{T}(M \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t &= F(\bar{x}^t) - F^* + \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \theta^\mathsf{T}_{ij}(\bar{x}^t_i - \bar{x}^t_j), \\
&= F(\bar{x}^t) - F^* + \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \alpha^\mathsf{T}_{ij}(\bar{x}^t_i - \bar{y}^t_{ij}) + \beta^\mathsf{T}_{ij}(\bar{x}^t_j - \bar{y}^t_{ij}), \\
&\le \frac{1}{\gamma t} \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \|\theta_{ij}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2t} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} L_i \left\|x^* - x^0_i\right\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2t} \left\|\mathbf{y}^* - \mathbf{y}^0\right\|^2_{\sum_{i=1}^N B_i^\top B_i}, \\
&\le \frac{1}{t}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}\|\theta\|^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{2c_i} \left\|x^* - x^0_i\right\|^2\right). \qquad (52)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, setting $\theta = \mathbf{0}$ in (52) leads to

$$F(\bar{x}^t) - F^* \le \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{2c_i} \left\|x^* - x^0_i\right\|^2. \qquad (53)$$

From convexity of Φ_i, (51) and the fact that $(M \otimes I_n)\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{0}$, it follows that

$$0 \le F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F^* + {\theta^*}^\top (M \otimes I_n)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t - \mathbf{x}^*) = F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F^* + {\theta^*}^\top (M \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t. \qquad (54)$$

Adding the last term to both sides, and invoking (52) for θ such that $\theta_{ij} = 2\theta^*_{ij}$ for $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$, we get

$$\theta^{*\mathsf{T}}(M \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t \leq F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F^* + (2\theta^*)^{\mathsf{T}}(M \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t \leq \frac{1}{t}\left(\frac{4}{\gamma}\left\|\theta^*\right\|^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{2c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right). \tag{55}$$

Invoking (52) once again for $\theta = \theta^* + (M \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t / \left\|(M \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\right\|$ and using (54), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \left\|\bar{x}_i^t - \bar{x}_j^t\right\|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left\|(M \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\right\| &\leq F(\bar{x}^t) - F^* + \theta^{*\mathsf{T}}(M \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t + \left\|(M \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\right\|, \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t}\left(\sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \frac{1}{\gamma}\left\|\theta^*_{ij} + \frac{\bar{x}_i^t - \bar{x}_j^t}{\|(M \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\|}\right\|^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{2c_i}\left\|x_i^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right), \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t}\left(\frac{2}{\gamma}(1 + \left\|\theta^*\right\|^2) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{2c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right), \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where the last inequality follows from $\|a+b\|^2 \leq 2\|a\|^2 + 2\|b\|^2$. Next, by appropriately choosing a dual optimal (50), we bound $\|\theta^*\|$, which appears in (55) and (56).

Recall that $M^\top M = \Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}|\times|\mathcal{N}|}$, i.e., the Laplacian of $\mathcal{G}$, and since $\mathcal{G}$ is connected, we have $\mathbf{rank}(M) = \mathbf{rank}(\Omega) = N - 1$ and $\psi_1 \geq \ldots \geq \psi_{N-1} > \psi_N = 0$, where $\{\psi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ denote the eigenvalues of Ω. Since $(M \otimes I_n)^\top \theta^*$ lies in the row space, there exists $\{\lambda_r\}_{r=1}^R$ such that $-(M \otimes I_n)^\top \theta^* = \sum_{r=1}^R \lambda_r v_r$. Following [15], choose $\bar{\theta} := -\sum_{r=1}^R u_r \lambda_r/\sigma_r = U\,\mathbf{diag}(\lambda/\sigma)$, where $\mathbf{diag}(\lambda/\sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^{R\times R}$ is a diagonal matrix with its r-th diagonal entry is λ_r/σ_r for $r = 1,\ldots,R$. Hence, $\bar{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{E}|}$ satisfies $-(M \otimes I_n)^{\mathsf{T}}\bar{\theta} = V\Sigma U^{\mathsf{T}} U\,\mathbf{diag}(\lambda/\sigma) = -(M \otimes I_n)^{\mathsf{T}}\theta^*$; therefore, $-(M \otimes I_n)^{\mathsf{T}}\bar{\theta} \in \partial F(\mathbf{x}^*)$ as well. Recall that the optimality conditions stated in (51) for the formulation (50) can be written more compactly as $\mathbf{0} \in \partial F(\mathbf{x}^*) + (M \otimes I_n)^\top \theta^*$; hence, $\bar{\theta}$ is an optimal dual solution to (50) as well. Finally, using the local bounds κ_i on the subdifferential of Φ_i at $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we can bound $\left\|\bar{\theta}\right\|$ from above as follows:

$$\left\|\bar{\theta}\right\|^2 = \sum_{r=1}^R \frac{\lambda_r^2}{\sigma_r^2} \leq \frac{1}{\psi_{N-1}} \sum_{r=1}^R \lambda_r^2 = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\Omega)}\left\|(M \otimes I_n)^\top \theta^*\right\|^2.$$

Hence, $\left\|\bar{\theta}\right\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\Omega)} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \kappa_i^2$. Thus, using this bound within (55) and (56), and combining the resulting inequalities together with (53) and (54) implies the desired bounds. □

Note when $\mathbf{x}^0$ is chosen such that $x_i^0 = \mathbf{0}$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, the bounds in Theorem 6 can be simplified further. Indeed, observe that $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{c_i}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2 = \left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} L_i + \gamma d_i\right)\left\|x^*\right\|^2 = (2\gamma|\mathcal{E}| + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} L_i)\left\|x^*\right\|^2$. Therefore, for all $t \geq 1$,

$$\max\left\{|F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F^*|,\ \Big(\sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}} \left\|\bar{x}_i^t - \bar{x}_j^t\right\|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\} \leq \frac{1}{t}\left[\frac{4}{\gamma}\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{\kappa_i^2}{\sigma_{\min}(\Omega)} + 1\right) + \left(\gamma|\mathcal{E}| + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{L_i}{2}\right)\left\|x^*\right\|^2\right].$$

5) Adaptive step-size strategy: One important property of DPGA methods is their ability to adopt an adaptive step-size sequence for each node. Note L_i, Lipschitz constants of ∇f_i, may not be known in advance or may be too large for certain nodes – leading to very small steps since $c_i = \mathcal{O}(L_i^{-1})$, i.e., $c_i = (L_i + \gamma d_i(d_i+1))^{-1}$ for DPGA-I, and $c_i = (L_i + \gamma d_i)^{-1}$ for DPGA-II – see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. On the other hand, it is elementary to check that all the proofs given above still go through if node $i \in \mathcal{N}$ uses the step size $c_i^k = (s_i^k + \gamma d_i(d_i+1))^{-1}$ for DPGA-I and $c_i^k = (s_i^k + \gamma d_i)^{-1}$ for DPGA-II at the k-th iteration such that

$$f_i(x_{k+1}^i) \leq f_i(x_k^i) + \left\langle \nabla f_i(x_k^i), \Delta_i^k \right\rangle + \frac{s_i^k}{2} \left\| \Delta_i^k \right\|^2 \tag{57}$$

holds, where $\Delta_i^k := x_{k+1}^i - x_k^i$ and x_{k+1}^i is computed using c_i^k instead of c_i. Clearly, $s_i^k \leq L_i$. Since this condition can be checked locally, one can possibly take longer steps compared to c_i and still has a convergence guarantee. In contrast, distributed algorithms that use constant step size $c > 0$ for all nodes, e.g., PG-EXTRA [19], cannot take advantage of this trick. We adopted the following rule in our numerical tests: let $\upsilon > 1$, for $k \geq 1$ we set $s_i^k = s_i^{k-1} \upsilon^{\ell_k - 1}$ where $\ell_k \geq 0$ is the smallest integer such that (57) holds, and $s_i^0 = L_i$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

6) Stochastic gradient variants of DPGA-I and DPGA-II: As corollaries of Theorem 5 and Theorem 6, we provide the error bounds for the stochastic gradient variants of DPGA-I and DPGA-II, displayed in Figure 3 and Figure 4, respectively. Both SDPGA-I and SDPGA-II employ SFO G_i defined in Definition 2 for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ instead of accessing to ∇f_i. Suppose that $\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \mathbf{ri}(\mathbf{dom}\, \xi_i) \neq \emptyset$ and $D := \max_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \sup_{x,x' \in \mathbf{dom}(\xi_i)} \|x - x'\| < +\infty$. Then under Assumption 1, slightly modifying the proofs of Theorem 5 and Theorem 6 by invoking the result of Lemma 3 for the case $\sigma > 0$, we immediately obtain the bounds for SDPGA-I in Corollary 7 and SDPGA-II in Corollary 8.

Corollary 7. *Given arbitrary $\mathbf{x}^0$ and $\gamma > 0$, let $p_i^0 = \mathbf{0}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}_{k\geq 1}$ be the SDPGA-I iterate sequence, generated as shown in Figure 3. The average sequence $\{\bar{x}^t\}_{t\geq 1}$, defined as $\bar{x}_i^t = (\sum_{k=1}^t x_i^k)/t$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $t \geq 1$, w.p.1 converges to an optimal solution to* (4) *with the following suboptimality and infeasibility bounds satisfied for all $t \geq 1$,*

$$|F\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\right]\right) - F^*| \leq \frac{1}{t}\left(\frac{2(d_{\max}+1)}{\gamma \sigma_{\min}^2(\Omega)} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \kappa_i^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{2c_i^0} \left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right) + \frac{N}{2\sqrt{t}}(D^2 + 2\sigma^2),$$

$$\left\|(\Omega \otimes I_n)\mathbb{E}\left[\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\right]\right\| \leq \frac{1}{t}\left(\frac{d_{\max}+1}{\gamma \sigma_{\min}^2(\Omega)} \left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \kappa_i^2 + \sigma_{\min}^2(\Omega)\right) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{2c_i^0} \left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right) + \frac{N}{2\sqrt{t}}(D^2 + 2\sigma^2),$$

where $\kappa_i > 0$ denotes an upper bound on the elements of $\partial\Phi_i(x^*)$, i.e., if $q \in \partial\Phi_i(x^*)$, then $\|q\| \leq \kappa_i$, for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Corollary 8. *Given arbitrary* $\mathbf{x}^0$ *and* $\gamma > 0$*, let* $p_i^0 = \mathbf{0}$ *for all* $i \in \mathcal{N}$*, and* $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}_{k\geq 1}$ *be the SDPGA-II iterate sequence, generated as shown in Figure 4. The average sequence* $\{\bar{x}^t\}_{t\geq 1}$*, defined as* $\bar{x}_i^t = (\sum_{k=1}^t x_i^k)/t$ *for* $i \in \mathcal{N}$ *and* $t \geq 1$*, w.p.1 converges to an optimal solution to* (4) *with the following suboptimality and infeasibility bounds satisfied for all* $t \geq 1$*,*

$$|F\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\right]\right) - F^*| \leq \frac{1}{t}\left(\frac{2(d_{\max}+1)}{\gamma\sigma_{\min}^2(\Omega)}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\kappa_i^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{2c_i^0}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right) + \frac{N}{2\sqrt{t}}(D^2+2\sigma^2),$$

$$\left\|(\Omega\otimes I_n)\mathbb{E}\left[\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\right]\right\| \leq \frac{1}{t}\left(\frac{d_{\max}+1}{\gamma\sigma_{\min}^2(\Omega)}\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\kappa_i^2 + \sigma_{\min}^2(\Omega)\right) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{2c_i^0}\left\|x^* - x_i^0\right\|^2\right) + \frac{N}{2\sqrt{t}}(D^2+2\sigma^2),$$

where $\kappa_i > 0$ *denotes an upper bound on the elements of* $\partial\Phi_i(x^*)$*, i.e., if* $q \in \partial\Phi_i(x^*)$*, then* $\|q\| \leq \kappa_i$*, for each* $i \in \mathcal{N}$*.*

Algorithm SDPGA-I ($\gamma, \mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{p}^0$)

Initialization: $s_i^0 = \mathbf{0}, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}$

Step k: ($k \geq 0$) For $i \in \mathcal{N}$ compute

0. $c_i^k = (\sqrt{k} + 1 + L_i + \gamma d_i(d_i+1))^{-1}$
1. $x_i^{k+1} = \mathbf{prox}_{c_i^k\xi_i}\Big(x_i^k - c_i^k\left[\nabla G_i(x_i^k,\zeta_i^k) + \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\Omega_{ij}(p_j^k + \gamma s_j^k)\right]\Big),\ i \in \mathcal{N}$
2. $s_i^{k+1} = \frac{1}{d_i+1}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\Omega_{ij}x_j^{k+1},\ i \in \mathcal{N}$
3. $p_i^{k+1} = p_i^k + \gamma s_i^{k+1}, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}$

Fig. 3. Stochastic Distributed Proximal Gradient Algorithm I

Algorithm SDPGA-II ($\gamma, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}$)

Initialization: $s_i^0 = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\Omega_{ij}x_j^0, \quad p_i^0 = \mathbf{0}, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}$

Step k: ($k \geq 0$) For $i \in \mathcal{N}$ compute

0. $c_i^k = (\sqrt{k} + 1 + L_i + \gamma d_i)^{-1}$
1. $x_i^{k+1} = \mathbf{prox}_{c_i^k\xi_i}\Big(x_i^k - c_i^k\left[\nabla G_i(x_i^k,\zeta_i^k) + \frac{1}{2}(p_i^k + \gamma s_i^k)\right]\Big),\ i \in \mathcal{N}$
2. $s_i^{k+1} = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\Omega_{ij}x_j^{k+1},\ i \in \mathcal{N}$
3. $p_i^{k+1} = p_i^k + \gamma s_i^{k+1},\ i \in \mathcal{N}$

Fig. 4. Stochastic Distributed Proximal Gradient Algorithm II

III. Numerical results

In this section, we compared DPGA-I and DPGA-II with PG-EXTRA, distributed ADMM and its variant proposed in [19], [15] and [20], respectively, on the *sparse group LASSO* problem with Huber loss:

$$\min_{x\in\mathbb{R}^n}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\left[\beta_1\|x\|_1 + \beta_2\|x\|_{G_i} + h_\delta\left(A_ix - b_i\right)\right], \tag{58}$$

where $\beta_1, \beta_2 > 0$, for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}$, $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$, and $\|x\|_{G_i} := \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left\|x_{g_i(k)}\right\|_2$ denotes the group norm with respect to the partition G_i of $[1,n] := \{1, \cdots, n\}$, i.e., $G_i = \{g_i(k)\}_{k=1}^{K}$ such that $\bigcup_{k=1}^{K} g_i(k) = [1,n]$, and $g_i(j) \cap g_i(k) = \emptyset$ for all $j \neq k$; and h_δ denotes the Huber loss function, i.e., for any $m \geq 1$ let $h_\delta : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $h_\delta(y) := \max\{z^\top y - \frac{1}{2}\|z\|^2 : \|z\|_\infty \leq \delta\}$. In this case, $f_i(x) := h_\delta(A_i x - b_i)$ and $\xi_i(x) := \beta_1 \|x\|_1 + \beta_2 \|x\|_{G_i}$.

Next, we briefly describe the competitive algorithms: PG-EXTRA [19], the distributed ADMM algorithm in [15]; and a more efficient variant to the ADMM that exploits the problem structure in (58). Recall that $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ denotes the Laplacian of the graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$, $\mathcal{N}_i := \mathcal{O}_i \cup \{i\}$, where $\mathcal{O}_i$ denotes the set of neighboring nodes of $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

A. Distributed ADMM Algorithm

As discussed in Section II-B1, (4) can be equivalently written as in (29). Makhdoumi & Ozdaglar [15] establish that when an ADMM algorithm with penalty parameter $\gamma > 0$ is implemented on (29) alternatingly minimizing in $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$, the subproblems can be simplified as shown in Figure 5; hence, the primal iterates $\mathbf{y}$ and the dual iterates λ are never computed in the implementation. It is shown in [15] that suboptimality and consensus violation converge to 0 with a rate $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$, and in each iteration every node communicates $2n$ scalars, i.e., $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $p_i + \gamma s_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, each node stores $3n$ scalars at each iteration, i.e., $x_i, s_i, p_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Algorithm ADMM ($\gamma, \mathbf{x}^0$)

Initialization: $c_i = (\gamma d_i (d_i + 1))^{-1}$, $p_i^0 = \mathbf{0}$, $i \in \mathcal{N}$

Step k: ($k \geq 0$) For $i \in \mathcal{N}$ compute

1. $x_i^{k+1} = \mathbf{prox}_{c_i(\xi_i + f_i)}\left(x_i^k - c_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Omega_{ij}\left(p_j^k + \gamma s_j^k\right)\right)$.
2. $s_i^{k+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Omega_{ij} x_j^{k+1} / (d_i + 1)$
3. $p_i^{k+1} = p_i^k + \gamma s_i^{k+1}$

Fig. 5. ADMM algorithm

From now on, we refer to this algorithm that directly works with $\Phi_i = \xi_i + f_i$ as **ADMM**– see Fig. 5. Computing $\mathbf{prox}_{\Phi_i}$ for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is the computational bottleneck in each iteration of **ADMM**. Note that computing $\mathbf{prox}_{\Phi_i}$ for (58) is almost as *hard* as solving the problem. To deal with this issue, Aybat et al. [20] considered the following reformulation:

$$\min_{\substack{x_i, y_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ z_i, \tilde{z}_i \in \mathcal{Z}_i}} \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \xi_i(x_i) + f_i(y_i) : \begin{array}{ll} \Omega_{ij} x_j = z_{ij}, & \Omega_{ij} y_j = \tilde{z}_{ij}, \quad i \in \mathcal{N},\ j \in \mathcal{N}_i \\ x_i = q_i, & y_i = q_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}, \end{array} \right\}$$

and proposed a split ADMM algorithm (SADMM), displayed in Fig. 6, where $c > 0$ denotes the penalty parameter. Steps of **SADMM** can be derived by minimizing the augmented Lagrangian alternatingly in $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, and in $(\mathbf{z}, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{q})$ while fixing the other. As in [15], computing $(\mathbf{z}, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{q})$ can be avoided by exploiting the structure of optimality conditions. Convergence of SADMM with $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ rate follows immediately from the results on the convergence of ADMM [26]. In each iteration of SADMM, every node communicates $4n$ scalars, i.e., $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $p_i + \gamma s_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\tilde{p}_i + \gamma \tilde{s}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, each node stores $7n$ scalars, i.e., $x_i, y_i, s_i, \tilde{s}_i, p_i, \tilde{p}_i, r_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Algorithm SADMM ($\gamma, \mathbf{x}^0$)

Initialization: $\mathbf{y}^0 = \mathbf{x}^0$, $c_i = (\gamma d_i(d_i+1) + \gamma)^{-1}$, $p_i^0 = \tilde{p}_i^0 = \mathbf{0}, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}$

Step k: ($k \geq 0$) For $i \in \mathcal{N}$ compute

1) $x_i^{k+1} = \mathbf{prox}_{c_i \xi_i}\Big(x_i^k - c_i\big[r_i^k + \gamma(x_i^k - y_i^k)/2 + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Omega_{ij}(p_j^k + \gamma s_j^k)\big]\Big)$
2) $y_i^{k+1} = \mathbf{prox}_{c_i f_i}\Big(y_i^k + c_i\big[r_i^k + \gamma(x_i^k - y_i^k)/2 - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Omega_{ij}(\tilde{p}_j^k + \gamma \tilde{s}_j^k)\big]\Big)$
3) $s_i^{k+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Omega_{ij} x_j^{k+1}/(d_i+1), \quad p_i^{k+1} = p_i^k + \gamma s_i^{k+1}$
4) $\tilde{s}_i^{k+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Omega_{ij} y_j^{k+1}/(d_i+1), \quad \tilde{p}_i^{k+1} = \tilde{p}_i^k + \gamma \tilde{s}_i^{k+1}$
5) $r_i^{k+1} = r_i^k + \gamma(x_i^{k+1} - y_i^{k+1})/2$

Fig. 6. Split ADMM algorithm

B. PG-EXTRA

Given two mixing matrices, $W = [W_{ij}]$, $\tilde{W} = [\tilde{W}_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}| \times |\mathcal{N}|}$, Shi et al. [19] show that PG-EXTRA, displayed in Fig. 7, can solve (3) with $\Phi_i = \xi_i + f_i$ as in (1) (ξ_i and f_i convex and ∇f_i is Lipchitz continuous with constant L_i) in a distributed fashion with $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ rates on sub-optimality and consensus violation in terms of *squared residuals* of KKT violation and consensus violation, respectively. It is assumed that W and $\tilde{W}$ satisfy: i) $W = W^\top$ and $\tilde{W} = \tilde{W}^\top$, ii) for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $W_{ij} = \tilde{W}_{ij} = 0$ for all $j \notin \mathcal{N}_i$, iii) $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}|} : \ (W - \tilde{W})x = \mathbf{0}\} = \{t\mathbf{1} : \ t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}|} : \ (I - \tilde{W})x = \mathbf{0}\} \supseteq \{t\mathbf{1} : \ t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, iv) $\tilde{W} \succ \mathbf{0}$ and $\frac{I+W}{2} \succeq \tilde{W} \succeq W$. For instance, when $W = W^\top$ such that $W_{ij} \geq 0$ for all i, j, and $W\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$, setting $\tilde{W} := \frac{I+W}{2}$ guarantees that $(W, \tilde{W})$ satisfy these assumptions. In our experiments, the mixing matrices are chosen as $W := I - \frac{\Omega}{d_{\max}+1}$ and $\tilde{W} := \frac{I+W}{2} = I - \frac{\Omega}{2(d_{\max}+1)}$ (see Section 2.3 in [21]).

According to [19], $\mathbf{x}^* = [x_i^*]_{i \in \mathcal{N}}$ is an optimal solution to (4) with $\Phi_i = \xi_i + f_i$ as in (1) if and only if there exist $\mathbf{q}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}$ and $\mathbf{g}^* = [g_i^*]_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}$ such that $\mathbf{q}^* = (U \otimes I_n)\mathbf{p}$ for some $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}$ and $g_i^* \in \partial \xi_i(x_i^*)$ satisfying $(U \otimes I_n)\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{0}$ and $(U \otimes I_n)\mathbf{q}^* + c(\mathbf{g}^* + \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)) = \mathbf{0}$, where $c > 0$ is the given step size parameter, $U := (\tilde{W} - W)^{1/2}$, and $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) := [\nabla f_i(x_i)]_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n|\mathcal{N}|}$

for any $\mathbf{x} = [x_i]_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$. Note that null space of U only contains $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}|}$; therefore, $(U \otimes I_n)\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ implies $x_1 = \ldots = x_N$.

Let $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ be the PG-EXTRA iterate sequence generated as in Fig. 7, and sequence $\{\mathbf{q}^k\}$ be defined as $\mathbf{q}^k = \sum_{t=0}^{k}(U \otimes I_n)\mathbf{x}^t$. According to Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 in [19], when the step size $c \in \left(0, \frac{2\lambda_{\min}(\tilde{W})}{L_{\max}}\right)$, where $L_{\max} = \max_{i\in\mathcal{N}} L_i$, then $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=0}^{t}\left\|(U \otimes I_n)\mathbf{q}^k + c(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \mathbf{g}^{k+1})\right\|^2_{\tilde{W}} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right), \tag{59}$$

$$\frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=0}^{t}\left\|(U \otimes I_n)\mathbf{x}^k\right\|^2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right), \tag{60}$$

where $g_i^{k+1} \in \partial\xi_i(x_i^{k+1})$. As also pointed out in the introduction, we consider this rate result as $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{t})$ because (59) can only guarantee $\|(U \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\| = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{t})$, where $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t := \sum_{k=1}^{t}\mathbf{x}^k/t$. On the other hand, according to Theorems 5 and 6, DPGA-I and DPGA-II iterate sequences satisfy $\|(\Omega \otimes I_n)\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\| = \mathcal{O}(1/t)$ and $(\sum_{(ij)\in\mathcal{E}}\|\bar{x}_i^t - \bar{x}_i^t\|^2)^{1/2} = \mathcal{O}(1/t)$, respectively.

Adopting mixing matrices $(W, \tilde{W})$ to be able to set the stepsize $c > 0$ independent of the global topology of $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ may still require certain parameters, determined by the global topology of $\mathcal{G}$, to be in the common knowledge of all nodes $\mathcal{N}$. In particular, $W = I - \frac{\Omega}{2d_{\max}} \succeq \mathbf{0}$ and $\tilde{W} = \frac{I+W}{2} \succeq \frac{1}{2}I$; hence, c can be chosen $c \in (0, \frac{1}{L_{\max}})$, which is independent of the global topology, and only depends on $L_{\max}$; however, all the nodes need to know $d_{\max}$, and $L_{\max}$ which can be computed using some max-consensus algorithm. This assumption may not be attainable for very large scale fully distributed networks, and computing parameters such as $L_{\max}$ and $d_{\max}$ may violate the privacy requirements of the nodes. Also note that since the stepsize $c > 0$ is the same for all nodes, PG-EXTRA cannot take advantage of the adaptive step size strategy discussed in Section II-B5.

Algorithm PG-EXTRA $\left(c, \mathbf{x}^0, W, \tilde{W}\right)$
Step 0: all nodes $i \in \mathcal{N}$ do
1. $x_i^{1/2} = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} W_{ij}x_j^0 - c\nabla f_i(x_i^0)$
2. $x_i^1 = \mathbf{prox}_{c\xi_i}(x_i^{1/2})$

Step k: ($k \geq 1$) all nodes $i \in \mathcal{N}$ do
1. $x_i^{k+1+1/2} = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} W_{ij}x_j^{k+1} - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\tilde{W}_{ij}x_j^k + x_i^{k+1/2} - c[\nabla f_i(x_i^{k+1}) - \nabla f_i(x_i^k)]$
2. $x_i^{k+2} = \mathbf{prox}_{c\xi_i}(x_i^{k+1+1/2})$

Fig. 7. Proximal Gradient Exact First-order Algorithm (PG-EXTRA)

C. Implementation details and numerical results

In Lemma 9, we show that $\mathbf{prox}_{\xi_i}$ can be computed in closed form. On the other hand, when **ADMM**, and **SADMM** are implemented on (58), one needs to compute $\mathbf{prox}_{\Phi_i}$ and $\mathbf{prox}_{f_i}$, respectively; and these proximal operations do not assume closed form solutions. To be fair, we computed them using an efficient interior point solver MOSEK (ver. 7.1.0.12).

Lemma 9. *Let* $\xi(x) = \beta_1\|x\|_1 + \beta_2\|x\|_G$. *For* $t > 0$ *and* $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x^p = \mathbf{prox}_{t\xi}(\bar{x})$ *is given by* $x^p_{g(k)} = \eta'_{g(k)} \max\left\{1 - \frac{t\beta_2}{\left\|\eta_{g(k)}\right\|_2},\ 0\right\}$ *for* $1 \le k \le K$, *where* $\eta' = \mathrm{sgn}(\bar{x}) \odot \max\{|\bar{x}| - t\beta_1, 0\}$.

Proof. This result is shown in [20]; for completeness we still include it here for completeness. Since the groups are not overlapping with each other, the proximal problem becomes separable in groups. Let $n_k := |g(k)|$ for all k. Thus, it suffices to show that $\min_{x_{g(k)}\in\mathbb{R}^{n_k}}\{\beta_1 \|x\|_1 + \beta_2 \left\|x_{g(k)}\right\|_2 + \frac{1}{2t}\left\|x_{g(k)} - \bar{x}_{g(k)}\right\|_2^2\}$ has a closed form solution as shown in the statement for some fixed k. By the definition of dual norm, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min_{x_{g(k)}\in\mathbb{R}^{n_k}} \beta_1 \left\|x_{g(k)}\right\|_1 + \beta_2\|x_{g(k)}\|_2 + \frac{1}{2t}\|x_{g(k)} - \bar{x}_{g(k)}\|_2^2, \\
&= \min_{x_{g(k)}\in\mathbb{R}^{n_k}} \max_{\|u_1\|_\infty\le\beta_1} u_1^\mathsf{T} x_{g(k)} + \max_{\|u_2\|_2\le\beta_2} u_2^\mathsf{T} x_{g(k)} + \frac{1}{2t}\|x_{g(k)} - \bar{x}_{g(k)}\|_2^2, \qquad (61)\\
&= \max_{\substack{\|u_1\|_\infty\le\beta_1\\ \|u_2\|_2\le\beta_2}} \min_{x\in\mathbb{R}^n} (u_1+u_2)^\mathsf{T} x_{g(k)} + \frac{1}{2t}\|x_{g(k)} - \bar{x}_{g(k)}\|_2^2, \qquad (62)\\
&= \max_{\substack{\|u_1\|_\infty\le\beta_1\\ \|u_2\|_2\le\beta_2}} (u_1+u_2)^\mathsf{T}\bar{x}_{g(k)} - \frac{t}{2}\|u_1+u_2\|_2^2. \qquad (63)
\end{aligned}$$

Let (u_1^*, u_2^*) be the optimal solution of (63). Since $x^p_{g(k)}$ is the optimal solution to (61), it follows from (62) that

$$x^p_{g(k)} = \bar{x}_{g(k)} - t(u_1^* + u_2^*). \qquad (64)$$

Note that (63) can be equivalently written as $\min\{\|u_1+u_2-\frac{1}{t}\bar{x}_{g(k)}\|_2^2 :\ \|u_1\|_\infty \le \beta_1, \|u_2\|_2 \le \beta_2\}$. Minimizing over u_2, we have

$$u_2^*(u_1) = \left(\frac{1}{t}\bar{x}_{g(k)} - u_1\right)\min\left\{\frac{\beta_2}{\|\frac{1}{t}\bar{x}_{g(k)} - u_1\|_2}, 1\right\}. \qquad (65)$$

Hence, we have

$$u_1^* = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\|u_1\|_\infty\le\beta_1} \left\|\left(u_1 - \frac{1}{t}\bar{x}_{g(k)}\right)\max\left\{1 - \frac{\beta_2}{\|u_1 - \frac{1}{t}\bar{x}_{g(k)}\|_2}, 0\right\}\right\|_2 = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\|u_1\|_\infty\le\beta_1} \max\left\{\left\|u_1 - \frac{1}{t}\bar{x}_{g(k)}\right\|_2 - \beta_2,\ 0\right\}.$$

Clearly, $u_1^* = \mathrm{argmin}_{\|u_1\|_\infty\le\beta_1} \|(u_1 - \frac{1}{t}\bar{x}_{g(k)})\|_2 = \mathrm{sgn}(\bar{x}_{g(k)}) \min\left\{\frac{1}{t}|\bar{x}_{g(k)}|, \beta_1\right\}$. The final result follows from combining (64) and (65). □

TABLE III
COMPARISON OF **DPGA-I, DPGA-II, PG-EXTRA**, **ADMM**, AND **SADMM** (TERMINATION TIME T=1800 SEC)

Size	Alg.	Rel. Suboptimality		Consensus Violation (V)		Walltime (sec.)		# of communication rounds		Solved?
		Case 1	Case 2	Case 1	Case 2	Case 1	Case 2	Case 1	Case 2	
	SDPT3	0	0	0	0	26	74	N/A	N/A	
	FISTA	1E-3	N/A	0	N/A	10	N/A	2173	N/A	
	DPGA-I (CS)	1E-3, 8E-4	1E-3, 8E-4	2E-5, 9E-5	2E-5, 9E-5	30, 34	31, 35	15350, 16276	15768, 16574	yes
	DPGA-II (CS)	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	9E-5, 2E-5	9E-5, 1E-5	27, 28	28, 30	7596, 7597	7829, 7804	yes
$N = 5$	DPGA-I (AS)	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	6E-5, 5E-5	6E-5, 5E-5	**14, 14**	**15, 15**	**4810, 4718**	**4942, 4850**	yes
$n_g = 100$	DPGA-II (AS)	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	7E-5, 5E-5	7E-5, 5E-5	**13, 13**	**13, 14**	**2328, 2340**	**2399, 2397**	yes
	PG-EXTRA	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	6E-8, 2E-8	5E-8, 2E-8	43, 46	46, 49	25246, 25244	25948, 25946	yes
	ADMM	4E-5, 3E-5	3E-5, 3E-5	1E-4, 1E-4	1E-4, 1E-4	996, 712	987, 709	618, 442	638, 458	yes
	SADMM	1E-4, 2E-4	1E-4, 2E-4	1E-4, 1E-4	1E-4, 1E-4	655, 713	668, 741	1984, 2188	2020, 2268	yes
	SDPT3	0	0	0	0	26	82	N/A	N/A	
	FISTA	1E-3	N/A	0	N/A	10	N/A	2173	N/A	
	DPGA-I (CS)	1E-3, 5E-4	1E-3, 5E-4	2E-5, 1E-4	2E-5, 1E-4	80, 116	84, 120	25106, 28552	25802, 28984	yes
	DPGA-II (CS)	4E-4, 1E-3	4E-4, 1E-3	1E-4, 2E-5	1E-4, 2E-5	90, 84	94, 88	15479, 12281	15717, 12622	yes
$N = 10$	DPGA-I (AS)	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	6E-5, 6E-5	7E-5, 6E-5	**41, 47**	**43, 49**	**7920, 7806**	**8120, 8000**	yes
$n_g = 100$	DPGA-II (AS)	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	8E-5, 8E-5	7E-5, 7E-5	**36, 40**	**38, 43**	**3775, 3791**	**3861, 3904**	yes
	PG-EXTRA	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	8E-8, 1E-8	6E-8, 9E-9	123, 150	131, 158	43346, 43340	44628, 44624	yes
	ADMM	9E-3, 2E-2	8E-3, 2E-2	6E-4, 2E-4	6E-4, 2E-4	T, T	T, T	696, 690	734, 726	no
	SADMM	2E-4, 7E-3	2E-4, 7E-3	1E-4, 7E-4	1E-4, 7E-4	T, T	T, T	3368, 3460	3404, 3452	no
	SDPT3	0	0	0	0	691	1381	N/A	N/A	
	FISTA	1E-3	N/A	0	N/A	253	N/A	8663	N/A	
	DPGA-I (CS)	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-5, 6E-5	2E-5, 6E-5	137, 144	141, 148	22864, 22626	23158, 22954	yes
	DPGA-II (CS)	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	7E-5, 8E-6	7E-5, 9E-6	131, 137	136, 141	11274, 11336	11419, 11482	yes
$N = 5$	DPGA-I (AS)	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	4E-5, 3E-5	4E-5, 3E-5	**60, 62**	**62, 63**	**7104, 7036**	**7190, 7108**	yes
$n_g = 300$	DPGA-II (AS)	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	4E-5, 3E-5	5E-5, 3E-5	**58, 59**	**59, 61**	**3478, 3502**	**3508, 3547**	yes
	PG-EXTRA	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	5E-8, 2E-8	5E-8, 2E-8	181, 190	186, 197	32644, 32642	33018, 33016	yes
	ADMM	4E-2, 9E-4	4E-2, 8E-4	4E-3, 1E-3	5E-3, 1E-3	T, T	T, T	230, 244	228, 242	no
	SADMM	5E-3, 2E-2	5E-3, 2E-2	2E-3, 3E-3	2E-3, 3E-3	T, T	T, T	1080, 1108	1080, 1100	no
	SDPT3	0	0	0	0	706	1463	N/A	N/A	
	FISTA	1E-3	N/A	0	N/A	253	N/A	8663	N/A	
	DPGA-I (CS)	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 9E-4	7E-6, 6E-5	7E-6, 6E-5	262, 330	270, 339	38040, 37592	38358, 38026	yes
	DPGA-II (CS)	9E-4, 1E-3	9E-4, 1E-3	7E-5, 7E-6	7E-5, 7E-6	246, 286	255, 294	18874, 18673	19124, 18831	yes
$N = 10$	DPGA-I (AS)	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	2E-5, 3E-5	2E-5, 3E-5	**112, 133**	**116, 137**	**11830, 11700**	**11966, 11806**	yes
$n_g = 300$	DPGA-II (AS)	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	3E-5, 3E-5	3E-5, 3E-5	**104, 117**	**107, 121**	**5737, 5742**	**5790, 5794**	yes
	PG-EXTRA	1E-3, 1E-3	1E-3, 1E-3	5E-8, 8E-9	6E-8, 8E-9	351, 424	361, 435	56492, 56488	56934, 56930	yes
	ADMM	5E-2, 7E-2	5E-2, 7E-2	6E-3, 6E-3	6E-3, 6E-3	T, T	T, T	236, 246	232, 242	no
	SADMM	5E-2, 6E-1	5E-2, 7E-1	4E-3, 2E-2	4E-3, 2E-2	T, T	T, T	1020, 1060	1020, 1064	no

In our experiments, the network was either a *star tree* or a *clique* with either 5 or 10 nodes. The remaining problem parameters defining $\{\xi_i, f_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$ were set as follows. We set $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \frac{1}{N}$, $\delta = 1$, and $K = 10$. Let $n = Kn_g$ for $n_g \in \{100, 300\}$, i.e., $n \in \{1000, 3000\}$. We generated partitions $\{G_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$ in two different ways. For test problems in **CASE 1**, we created a single partition $G = \{g(k)\}_{k=1}^K$ by generating K groups uniformly at random such that $|g(k)| = n_g$ for all k; and set $G_i = G$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, i.e., $\xi_i(x) := \beta_1 \|x\|_1 + \beta_2 \|x\|_G$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. For the test problems in **CASE 2**, we created a different partition G_i for each node i, in the same manner as in **Case 1**. For all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $m_i = \frac{n}{2N}$, $\mathbb{R}^{m_i} \ni b_i = A_i\bar{x}$ for $\bar{x}_j = (-1)^j e^{-(j-1)/n_g}$ for $j \in [1, n]$, and $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i\times n}$ is set as $A_i = 0.5^{\pi_i}\bar{A}_i$, where the elements of $\bar{A}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i\times n}$ are i.i.d. with standard Gaussian, and $\{\pi_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$ are i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables with success probability $\frac{1}{2}$. Our choice of $\{A_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$ will make sure that there is a significant deviation among $\{L_i\}$, i.e.,

$\max_{i\in\mathcal{N}} L_i / \min_{i\in\mathcal{N}} L_i \approx 4$ since $L_i = \sigma^2_{\max}(A_i)$. This type of setting is expected to *adversely* affect constant step algorithms, e.g., $c = \mathcal{O}(1/L_{\max})$ for PG-EXTRA. For all the algorithms, we initialize the iterate sequence from the origin. And for ADMM methods, the penalty parameter was chosen specifically for each problem setup by searching for the best penalty over a line segment where the total number of ADMM iterations to terminate exhibits a convex behavior – similar to Section 4.2.1 in [27].

We solved the distributed optimization problem (4) using **PG-EXTRA, DPGA-I, DPGA-II**, **ADMM**, and **SADMM** for both cases, on both star trees, and cliques, and for $N \in \{5, 10\}$ and $n_g \in \{100, 300\}$. For each problem setting, we randomly generated 5 instances. For benchmarking, we solved the central problem (58) using SDPT3 for both cases. Note that for **Case 1**, $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \xi_i(x) = \|x\|_1 + \|x\|_G$ and its prox map can be computed efficiently, while for **Case 2**, $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \xi_i(x)$ does not assume a simple prox map. Therefore, for **Case 1** we were also able to use FISTA [28]–[30] to solve the central problem (58) by exploiting the result of Lemma 9. All the algorithms are terminated when the relative suboptimality, $|F^k - F^*|/|F^*|$, is less than 10^{-3}, and consensus violation, V^k, is less than 10^{-4}, where F^k equals $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \Phi_i(x_i^k)$ for **PG-EXTRA, DPGA-I, DPGA-II**, **DFAL** and **ADMM**, and to $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \Phi_i\left(\frac{x_i^k + y_i^k}{2}\right)$ for **SADMM**; V^k equals to $\max_{(ij)\in\mathcal{E}} \left\|x_i^k - x_j^k\right\|_2 / \sqrt{n}$ for **PG-EXTRA, DPGA-I, DPGA-II**, **DFAL**, and **ADMM**, and to $\max\{\max_{(ij)\in\mathcal{E}} \left\|x_i^k - x_j^k\right\|_2,\ \max_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \left\|x_i^k - y_i^k\right\|_2\}/\sqrt{n}$ for **SADMM**. If the stopping criteria are not satisfied in $T = 1800$ seconds (30 min.), we terminated the algorithm and report the statistics corresponding to the iterate at the termination.

We solved the *central* problem (58) with SDPT3 and FISTA for benchmarking. We run DPGA algorithms on the *decentralized* problem both with constant step and adaptive step rules - see Section II-B5. In Table III, 'xxx (CS)' and 'xxx (AS)' stand for "algorithm xxx is used with constant step and adaptive step rules, respectively." We used PG-EXTRA, ADMM, and SADMM with suggested parameters. For the results separated by comma, the left and right ones are for the star tree and clique, respectively. Table III displays the means over 5 replications for each case. Table III shows that DPGA-I, DPGA-II and PG-EXTRA finish the jobs much faster than ADMM and SADMM – as expected due to not so simple $\mathbf{prox}_{\Phi_i}$ and $\mathbf{prox}_{f_i}$ operations required for ADMM and SADMM, respectively. PG-EXTRA runs slower than DPGA, mainly because it uses a stepsize that is the same for all the nodes. Moreover, adaptive step-size strategy worked very well in our tests, and it lead to speedup for both DPGA-I and DPGA-II by a factor of at least

2 when compared to constant step-size strategy. It is worth mentioning that run-times reported do not include the effect of communication. However, in real life, transmitting information also takes time. The number of communication rounds per iteration are 2 for DPGA-I, 1 for DPGA-II, 2 for PG-EXTRA, 2 for ADMM, and 4 for SADMM - see Table II. Thus, we expect the result to be more in favor of DPGA-II as the communication time is also taken into consideration when implemented in real networks.

IV. Conclusion

In this paper, we studied distributed proximal gradient ADMM and its stochastic counterpart for distributed minimization of composite convex functions over connected networks. The convergence rates of these methods were analyzed. Comparing with existing works, the advantages of our methods are as follows: DPGA-I, DPGA-II, SDPGA-I and SDPGA-II are fully distributed, i.e., the agents are *not* required to know any global parameters depending on the entire network topology, e.g., the second smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian; instead, we only assume that agents know who their neighbors are. Using only local communication, our *node-based* distributed algorithms require less communication burden and memory storage compared to edge-based distributed algorithms. The proposed algorithms consist of a *single loop*, i.e., there are no outer and inner iteration loops; therefore, they are easy and practical to be implemented over distributed networks. To sum up, there are many practical problems where one can compute the prox map for ξ_i efficiently; however, computing the prox map for $\Phi_i = \xi_i + f_i$ is not easy. The methods proposed in this paper can compute an ϵ-optimal ϵ-feasible solution in $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ iterations *without* assuming bounded ∇f_i for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, where each iteration requires computing $\mathbf{prox}_{\xi_i}$ and ∇f_i for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and one or two communication rounds among the neighbors – hence, $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ communications per node in total. While we are finalizing our paper, we become aware of the work [31] by Hong and Chang that is closely related to ours, where the authors also develop a proximal gradient consensus algorithm based on linearized ADMM.

References

[1] J. N. Tsitsiklis. *Problems in Decentralized Decision Making and Computation*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1984.

[2] T.-H. Chang, M. Hong, and X. Wang. Multi-agent distributed optimization via inexact consensus ADMM. *Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, 63(2):482–497, 2015.

[3] Victor Lesser, Charles L Ortiz Jr, and Milind Tambe. *Distributed sensor networks: A multiagent perspective*, volume 9. Springer, 2003.

[4] Qing Ling and Zhi Tian. Decentralized sparse signal recovery for compressive sleeping wireless sensor networks. *Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, 58(7):3816–3827, 2010.

[5] Chiara Ravazzi, Sophie Marie Fosson, and Enrico Magli. Distributed iterative thresholding for ℓ_0/ℓ_1-regularized linear inverse problems. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 61(4):2081–2100, 2015.

[6] Ioannis D Schizas, Alejandro Ribeiro, and Georgios B Giannakis. Consensus in ad hoc WSNs with noisy links - Part I: Distributed estimation of deterministic signals. *Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, 56(1):350–364, 2008.

[7] Pedro A Forero, Alfonso Cano, and Georgios B Giannakis. Consensus-based distributed support vector machines. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:1663–1707, 2010.

[8] Ryan McDonald, Keith Hall, and Gideon Mann. Distributed training strategies for the structured perceptron. In *Human Language Technologies: The 2010 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 456–464. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2010.

[9] F. Yan, S. Sundaram, S. Vishwanathan, and Y. Qi. Distributed autonomous online learning: Regrets and intrinsic privacy-preserving properties. *Knowledge and Data Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 25(11):2483–2493, 2013.

[10] Hendrik P Lopuhaa and Peter J Rousseeuw. Breakdown points of affine equivariant estimators of multivariate location and covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 229–248, 1991.

[11] Gonzalo Mateos, Juan Andrés Bazerque, and Georgios B Giannakis. Distributed sparse linear regression. *Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, 58(10):5262–5276, 2010.

[12] J. C. Duchi, A. Agarwal, and M. J. Wainwright. Dual averaging for distributed optimization: Convergence analysis and network scaling. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 57(3):592–606, 2012.

[13] Angelia Nedic and Asuman Ozdaglar. Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization. *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, 54(1):48–61, 2009.

[14] Ermin Wei and Asuman Ozdaglar. Distributed alternating direction method of multipliers. In *Decision and Control (CDC), 2012 IEEE 51st Annual Conference on*, pages 5445–5450. IEEE, 2012.

[15] Ali Makhdoumi and Asuman Ozdaglar. Broadcast-based distributed alternating direction method of multipliers. In *Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), 2014 52nd Annual Allerton Conference on*, pages 270–277. IEEE, 2014.

[16] Ermin Wei and Asuman Ozdaglar. On the o (1/k) convergence of asynchronous distributed alternating direction method of multipliers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1307.8254*, 2013.

[17] Dusan Jakovetic, Joao Xavier, and Jose MF Moura. Fast distributed gradient methods. *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, 59(5):1131–1146, 2014.

[18] Annie I Chen and Asuman Ozdaglar. A fast distributed proximal-gradient method. In *Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), 2012 50th Annual Allerton Conference on*, pages 601–608. IEEE, 2012.

[19] Wei Shi, Qing Ling, Gang Wu, and Wotao Yin. A proximal gradient algorithm for decentralized composite optimization. *Submitted to IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 2015.

[20] N. S. Aybat, Z. Wang, and G. Iyengar. An asynchronous distributed proximal gradient method for composite convex optimization. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-15)*, pages 2454–2462. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2015.

[21] Wei Shi, Qing Ling, Gang Wu, and Wotao Yin. Extra: An exact first-order algorithm for decentralized consensus optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(2):944–966, 2015.

[22] Pascal Bianchi, Walid Hachem, and Franck Iutzeler. A stochastic primal-dual algorithm for distributed asynchronous composite optimization. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Global Conference on Signal and Information Processing (GlobalSIP)*, pages 732–736, 2014.

[23] Q. Ling, W. Shi, G. Wu, and A. Ribeiro. DLM: Decentralized linearized alternating direction method of multipliers. *Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, 63(15):4051–4064, 2015.

[24] T. Lin, S. Ma, and S. Zhang. An extragradient-based alternating direction method for convex minimization. *Accepted in Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 2015.

[25] X. Gao, B. Jiang, and S. Zhang. On the information-adaptive variants of the ADMM: an iteration complexity perspective. *preprint*, 2014.

[26] Bingsheng He and Xiaoming Yuan. On the $\mathcal{O}(1/n)$ convergence rate of the douglas-rachford alternating direction method. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 50(2):700–709, 2012.

[27] N.S. Aybat and G. Iyengar. An alternating direction method with increasing penalty for stable principal component pursuit. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 61(3):635–668, 2015.

[28] A. Beck and M. Teboulle. A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems. *SIAM J. Img. Sci.*, 2(1):183–202, March 2009.

[29] Yu Nesterov. Gradient methods for minimizing composite functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 140(1):125–161, 2013.

[30] Paul Tseng. On accelerated proximal gradient methods for convex-concave optimization. *submitted to SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 2008.

[31] Mingyi Hong and Tsung-Hui Chang. Stochastic proximal gradient consensus over random networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.08905*, 2015.